

LATE ANTIQUE  
AND BYZANTINE ANKARA

CLIVE FOSS

IN the eight centuries from the reign of Diocletian until its conquest by the Seljuk Turks, Ankara flourished as one of the most important cities of Anatolia. Located on the busiest highway in the country, it long maintained a role as a provincial capital, a military base, and a center of trade, industry, and intellectual life. Its history is known from a variety of sources—histories of the Empire and Church, letters, speeches, laws, lives of saints, inscriptions, and others—which offer considerable, if sporadic, detail, providing far more information on the first three centuries than on the succeeding half millennium. The whole period falls into two discrete and clearly definable divisions: the late antique, from Diocletian to Heraclius, and the Byzantine, from Heraclius until the Turkish conquest. They are separated by an event of major significance: the capture and destruction of Ankara by the Sassanian Persians in 622. Previous to this event, the city was a large and developed metropolis with monumental public buildings, spreading far into the plain beneath its acropolis; subsequently, it consisted of an imposing fortress on the acropolis containing the main settlement, with a field of ruins and perhaps scattered habitations outside the walls. Although the period after the disaster is relatively obscure, material is available to provide a narrative history of both.<sup>1</sup>

#### LOCATION AND RESOURCES

Ankara owed its growth and prominence to its location on a highway which in Late Antiquity became one of the most heavily trafficked in the Empire. It occupied, in addition, a strategic junction from which roads radiated in all directions. The main highway led from Europe to the eastern frontier: from Thrace and Constantinople through Nicomedia and Nicaea to Ankara, and thence to the Cilician Gates and Syria. Other significant roads connected Ankara with eastern Bithynia and Nicomedia, with Dorylaeum and the Propontis, with Gangra and Paphlagonia, and, to the east, with Amasea and the Pontus, Sebastea and the northern part of the frontier, and Cappadocian Caesarea and the Euphrates. All of these were of commercial and military importance: those which ran between Ankara and the frontier became increasingly busy as wars in the East grew more frequent in the late second and third centuries. In that period, Ankara became the center of the defensive

<sup>1</sup> For classical Ancyra, see A. Erzen, *İlkçağda Ankara* (Ankara, 1946), and the references in the following note. The history of the city in Late Antiquity, though of some interest, has been neglected; for the Byzantine and Seljuk periods (seventh to fourteenth centuries), see P. Wittek, "Zur Geschichte Angoras im Mittelalter," *Festschrift Georg Jakob* (Leipzig, 1932), 329–54; F. Taeschner, "Ankara," in *EI*<sup>2</sup>; and the numerous references in S. Vryonis, *The Decline of Medieval Hellenism in Asia Minor* (Los Angeles, 1971), index, *s.v.* Ankara, most of which refer to the Turkish period. For the purposes of this discussion, two chronological terms will be used consistently: late antique, to denote the period from Diocletian to Heraclius, and Byzantine, from the reign of Heraclius to the Turkish conquest. For convenience, I shall generally refer to the city by its modern name, Ankara; the name of the ancient city was Ancyra, pronounced 'Ankira' or 'Angira' by the Byzantines.

system of Asia Minor—a major supply base, a place where the troops could take up winter quarters, and a gathering point for new recruits. Naturally, numerous emperors and their armies passed through the city on their way to the wars and contributed to the local economy.<sup>2</sup>

Although Galatia, a country of the interior with a rigorous climate and few trees, was sparsely populated compared with the rich provinces of the Aegean region, it was well suited for raising sheep and goats and supported the related industries of textile production and the manufacture of dyes. In all probability, much of this industry was centered in Ankara and served the needs of the army.<sup>3</sup> With its importance for trade, industry, and the army, it is not surprising that Ankara became the capital of Roman Galatia and remained an administrative center for a millennium, long after the Empire and its organization had changed beyond all recognition.

In Late Antiquity the factors which had been responsible for the growth of Ankara gave it continued and even increased importance and prosperity. When the capital was moved to Constantinople, the highway through Ankara became the main route between the capital and the East. During the fourth century in particular, when the imperial residence was often at Antioch (Constantius II stayed there from 337–51, Julian for about half his reign, and Valens from 371–78), the court, the army, and officials and messengers of all kinds constantly passed through the city. In maps and guides of the age, therefore, Ankara occupies a prominent place. The *Antonine Itinerary*, revised in the early fourth century, lists the three routes which connected the West with Ankara, as well as those from Ankara to Tivium and Caesarea. In 333 a Christian of Bordeaux made a pilgrimage to the Holy Land and left behind a detailed record of the highway that led there. He listed not only the cities, but also the *mutationes*, where it was possible to change horses and rest, and the *mansiones*, small towns which offered overnight accommodation, for the whole route was well organized for official or private travelers. In Asia Minor the pilgrim passed through Galatia and Ankara; the entire region, which stretched for about 200 miles, contained only three cities, but there was a

<sup>2</sup> For the roads, see D. Magie, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor* (Princeton, 1950), 1308ff. (a useful summary with references); W. M. Ramsay, *The Historical Geography of Asia Minor* (London, 1890), to be used with the usual caution; J. G. C. Anderson, "Exploration in Galatia cis Halym," *JHS*, 191 (1899), 52–134 (with a detailed map and discussion of topographical questions); S. Mitchell, *The History and Archaeology of Galatia* (diss. Oxford, 1974), unpublished dissertation dealing with the classical period; I. W. Macpherson, "Roman Roads and Milestones of Galatia," *AnatSt*, 4 (1954), 111–20 (new milestones); and especially E. Gren, *Kleinasien und der Ostbalkan in der wirtschaftlichen Entwicklung der römischen Kaiserzeit* (Uppsala, 1941), 44f., 107, 110, and index, s.v. Ankyra. For the routes between Ankara and the East, see F. Hild, *Das byzantinische Strassensystem in Kappadokien* (Vienna, 1977), 34–41, 77–84, 104–12. Evidence for the military importance of the highway through Ankara in the classical period is provided by the representations of military standards on the coins of cities located along it: see the discussions of C. Bosch, in *AA* (1931), 426f., and, in more detail, *idem*, *Die kleinasiatischen Münzen der römischen Kaiserzeit*, II, pt. 1 (Stuttgart, 1935), 95–99. Note particularly the inscriptions of Ancyra from the reign of Trajan in honor of a citizen who provided hospitality for the troops spending the winter in the city on their way to the eastern frontier: E. Bosch, *Quellen zur Geschichte der Stadt Ankara im Altertum* (Ankara, 1967) (hereafter Bosch, *Quellen*), nos. 105–6.

<sup>3</sup> Textiles and dyes: Pliny, *Hist. nat.*, IX.141, XXII.3, XVI.32, XXIX.33.

*mutatio* or a *mansio* about every ten miles. A less detailed, but still significant, record is provided by a fragmentary Egyptian papyrus of the fifth century, which contains a somewhat garbled list of towns between Egypt and the capital; the route is essentially the same as that of the Bordeaux pilgrim, and the name of Ankara duly appears. The only map which survives from Late Antiquity, the *Peutinger Table*, naturally shows the route and the stations along it between Constantinople and the Cilician Gates via Ankara; it also includes the highway from Ankara to Tavium and the East in a rather confused form. On this map, Ankara is shown as a walled city with six towers, a conventional portrayal of an important place.<sup>4</sup>

The importance of Ankara is well summarized in one late antique source, the *Expositio totius mundi et gentium*, a description of the Empire compiled around the middle of the fourth century:

*Inde obviat Galatia provincia optima sibi sufficiens. Negotiatur vestem plurimam; aliquotiens vero et milites bonos dominis praestat. Et habet civitatem maximam quae dicitur Ancyra. Divinum panem et eminentissimam manducare dicitur.*<sup>5</sup>

This reveals that the province was rich in grain, pasture, and manpower, and was a center of trade in textiles, probably manufactured locally. The metropolis, therefore, would have had a significant commercial and industrial role, and, in fact, Galatian merchants were famous in Late Antiquity. When for example, the Emperor Julian was urged to attack the Goths in 362, he replied that there was no need, since the Galatian slave traders, who sold Goths everywhere, were already enough for them.<sup>6</sup> Similarly, the poet Claudian, writing in 399 against the eunuch consul Eutropius, pictures him in his youth standing in the train of a Galatian slave trader, waiting for a buyer.<sup>7</sup> Throughout the period, active Galatians frequented the eastern provinces with different purposes—as pilgrims to the Holy Land and Egypt, and occasionally as monks to join the religious communities in those lands.<sup>8</sup>

#### CRISIS AND RECOVERY: FROM VALERIAN TO CONSTANTINE

As long as the frontiers were securely guarded, the highways brought prosperity to the city; but during the troubles of the mid-third century the same routes could provide easy access for an enemy to a rich and un plundered land, and Ankara suffered accordingly. When Valerian set out for the East to meet the invasion of the Persians, he stopped in Ankara and repaired the

<sup>4</sup> Antonine Itinerary: K. Miller, *Itineraria romana* (Stuttgart, 1916), liv–lxvii; Bordeaux pilgrim: *ibid.*, lxviii–lxxx; C. Noordegraaf, "A Geographical Papyrus," *Mnemosyne*, 6 (1938), 273–310. The name of the city is spelled ANKAΓPA, perhaps indicating a popular pronunciation of the name Ancyra similar to its modern form and otherwise unattested; *Peutinger Table*: *ibid.*, 656–67, 672f. The city was walled, in fact, in Late Antiquity, as shown on the Table.

<sup>5</sup> *Expositio*, cap. 41, ed. J. Rougé (Paris, 1966), 178, with parallel and virtually identical text of a somewhat later and shorter work, the *Descriptio totius orbis*.

<sup>6</sup> Ammianus Marcellinus, XXII.7.8.

<sup>7</sup> Claudian, *In Eutropium*, I.59.

<sup>8</sup> Individual Galatian pilgrims and monks will be considered below.



military highway before proceeding to his headquarters in Antioch.<sup>9</sup> His efforts met with disaster; the Persians advanced into Asia Minor, seized Caesarea in Cappadocia, and in 260 took the Emperor prisoner.<sup>10</sup> After this calamity, the Goths penetrated to Pessinus in Galatia and to Cappadocia, apparently following the great highway. At Parnassus in Cappadocia, a town on the highway near the frontier of Galatia, they captured a great treasure and many prisoners, among whom were the ancestors of Ulfilas, the bishop who converted the Goths to Christianity.<sup>11</sup> In this campaign the Goths probably attacked Ankara, if they did not take it. Not long after, Zenobia moved into Asia Minor and seized the lands as far west as Ankara.<sup>12</sup> Her rule was ephemeral; in 271 Aurelian recaptured Ankara and finally restored the eastern provinces to the Empire. When the area was again in imperial hands, he carried out extensive repairs to the highways, laying the foundation for a restoration of prosperity.<sup>13</sup>

Inscriptions and saints' lives give some indication of conditions during this time of crisis. An anonymous benefactor built the city wall from the foundations "during the shortage of food and barbarian attacks"; he also rebuilt the gymnasium of Polyeidus which had been ruined, and restored the office of registrar of members of the local senate, which had long been abandoned.<sup>14</sup> Another public-spirited citizen, called John "the Restorer" from his works, also carried out extensive repairs which suggest the degree of destruction and neglect which had prevailed in the late third century. He effected a major restoration of the Polyeidan gymnasium, and repaired a part of the Palace and the building of Theodotus; he was in charge of the public prison, the aqueduct, and the reservoir, which were perhaps in disrepair, and provided the city with many other public works.<sup>15</sup> Ankara thus would seem to have suffered considerable damage during the attacks of the 260's; public buildings were ruined and public services were interrupted.

At the same time, famine, the natural accompaniment of war and the frequent passage of armies, was especially severe. It afflicted the city on at least two occasions: during the reign of Aurelian and again around 280. After the recapture of the city from Zenobia, the local economy was probably in desperate straits from the invasions, and the food supply of the city was

<sup>9</sup> This work is attested by milestones: Bosch, *Quellen*, nos. 281 and 285, with commentary; to these should be added milestones 1 and 7a published by Macpherson (note 2 *supra*).

<sup>10</sup> The narrative of these events is confused, and their sequence subject to widely varying interpretations: see, for example, the divergent accounts of W. Ensslin and A. Alföldi, in *CAH*, XII, 133-36 and 170ff.

<sup>11</sup> Gothic attacks: Magie, *op. cit.*, 1566-68, and Alföldi, in *CAH*, XII, 148, 721-23, both with full reference to the sources; ancestors of Ulfilas (from the village of Sadagolthina in the territory of Parnassus): Philostorgius, II. 5.

<sup>12</sup> Zosimus, I. 50, a passage which leaves no doubt that Ankara had been taken by Zenobia.

<sup>13</sup> Milestones of Aurelian: Bosch, *Quellen*, nos. 295, 296.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, no. 289, presumably to be dated to the time of the Tetrarchy, since the dedicand was apparently still alive. He may be the governor who completed and dedicated the wall to the city, and whose name is likewise missing: *ibid.*, no. 290. Two other inscriptions, nos. 292 and 293, are possibly also to be associated with construction of the wall. Both fragmentary, they mention the *clarissimus* Aur. Dionysius Argaeinus, who completed an unspecified building at an unknown time.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, no. 306, probably of the time of Constantine or later because of the Christian name.

endangered. The steps which the government took to relieve the situation are revealed in a short account of a local martyr. In the reign of Aurelian, a grain merchant named Philumenus traveled from his native Lycaonia to bring wheat to Galatia. When he arrived in Ankara, he was denounced as a Christian and put to death.<sup>16</sup> His journey of a hundred miles or more to a place which normally produced a surplus of grain may be taken to illustrate the severity of the famine and methods adopted for its control. Famine again struck Ankara when St. Clement, born in 265, was a young man not yet eighteen. The narrative of his life records that the precocious Saint performed great acts of charity when men and beasts were perishing from starvation. He rescued pagan children whose parents had died or abandoned them by the road, fed and clothed them, and brought them up as Christians with the providential assistance of an older Christian lady of some wealth.<sup>17</sup> The charity of the Christians thus supplemented the efforts of the government to relieve the situation.

Diocletian finally restored settled conditions in which urban life could flourish, and carried out a reorganization of provincial administration. Galatia, a vast area which had stretched from the Pontic mountains to the Taurus, was considerably reduced, so that it consisted only of the northern part of the central Anatolian plateau. Ankara remained the capital, as it did after a second reduction under Theodosius which detached the western part of Galatia, making it into a new province with its capital at Pessinus. Thereafter, Galatia Prima, the province of Ankara, was ruled by a governor with the relatively high rank of *consularis* and contained five minor cities and one urbanized region in addition to the metropolis.<sup>18</sup> It is possible that the headquarters of the vicar of Pontus, whose diocese extended over the whole of northern Asia Minor from the Bosphorus to the Euphrates, was also in Ankara.<sup>19</sup>

<sup>16</sup> *Synaxarium CP*, 263f.

<sup>17</sup> *Vita Clementis*, PG, 114, cols. 816–93; for the famine, see col. 824. The date of Clement's birth is given (col. 816) as the twelfth year of Valerian, when Valerian and Lucianus were consuls, which at first sight seems impossible: Valerian reigned only eight years, and shared the consulship each time he held it with his son Gallienus. The twelfth year of Gallienus, however, was 264/65; in 265 the consuls were Licinius Valerianus and Lucillus. This, therefore, must be the year which the author of the *Vita* intended and which he indicated with remarkable accuracy for such a source. The *Life* contains several historical references which may be worthy of some trust.

<sup>18</sup> For the division under Theodosius, see Malalas, 348, and for the cities, Hierocles, *Synecdemus*, 696.4–697.2. The date on which the governor assumed the title *consularis* is uncertain, but it would seem to be earlier than the Theodosian division of the province. An inscription from Appola, about twenty miles southwest of Amorium in Phrygia and apparently part of its territory, mentions a *consularis* of Galatia: W. M. Calder, "Julia-Ipsus and Augustopolis," *JRS*, 2 (1912), 255–57, no. 13, republished in *MAMA*, I, 439; cf. *PLRE*, s.v. . . . tic(ius), where the stone is incorrectly attributed to Ipsus, apparently because of the title of the original publication. The inscription, a fragmentary boundary stone commencing with a cross, comes from a district which belonged to Galatia Salutaris after the division. Since Salutaris was governed by a *praeses*, mention of a *consularis* suggests that the inscription antedates the division, and that the governor of Galatia was already *consularis* in the fourth century. It is also possible that the inscription belongs to a time later than that of Hierocles, and that the governor of Salutaris was then promoted to *consularis*, an assumption for which there is no corroboration.

<sup>19</sup> The evidence is too complex to treat here; I hope to discuss it in detail elsewhere. The most important indications that the vicar may have had his seat in Ankara consist of the following: *Vita Clementis*, col. 825: the Saint tried in Ankara before the vicar; *Vita Platonis*, PG, 115, col. 404: the vicar Agrippinus presides in Ankara; St. Basil, *Ep.* 225: bishops summoned to the judgment seat

Administration of the city was in the hands of the local Senate with whom the People was nominally associated.<sup>20</sup>

The attentions of the regime of Diocletian are evident in the restoration of the highway system, which had apparently fallen into disrepair during the long period of crisis. Under the Tetrarchy, the main highway was rebuilt, as was the road which led westward to Germe and Dorylaeum.<sup>21</sup> The same period saw the beginning of restorations in the city which apparently continued into the fourth century, and involved the city wall and numerous important public buildings.

The age of Diocletian is famed for the Great Persecution, which claimed several victims at Ankara. The pious narratives of their sufferings, though largely fictitious, contain some important details about the city.

St. Clement of Ancyra is the best known of the local saints. A native of Ankara and already a noted philanthropist as a young man, his sufferings began under Diocletian when he was taken before the vicar Domitianus in Ankara, interrogated, and beaten severely. When he could not be brought to recant, he was sent to be tried before the Emperor. As he left Ankara, Clement prayed to the Lord to protect the city from the Devil and tyrants; the civic patriotism which had characterized earlier centuries was still vital. After numerous trials, he was sent back to his native Ankara and executed at a place called Cryptus. The orphans whom he had rescued from the famine many years before had already been slaughtered at the same place, as had his associates Agathangelus and the deacons Christopher and Chariton. Clement and Agathangelus were buried in a deep tomb at Cryptus, near the entrance of a church which stood there at the time the life was written by a man evidently familiar with the local topography. The deacons were buried nearby, and a small shrine was eventually dedicated to their memory.<sup>22</sup>

St. Plato, a contemporary martyr, was more famous than Clement in Late Antiquity. A church in Ankara was dedicated to him and his cult, celebrated in the Galatian countryside, had spread to Constantinople by the sixth century; he seems, indeed, to have been the patron saint of the city.<sup>23</sup> His life, however, provides few details beyond the usual narrative of interrogation, torture, and execution. In the reign of Galerius, Plato was denounced to the vicar Agrippinus who was presiding in the basilica opposite the temple of

---

of the vicar in Ankara; Justinian, *Novel VIII*: vicariate of Pontus abolished and combined with the governorship of Galatia Prima, which suggests that they shared a capital. On the other hand, there is evidence which shows vicars active in other cities; it does not necessarily contradict the notion that they had their headquarters in Ankara, for none of the other sources mentions a headquarters elsewhere, nor would it be unnatural for the vicar, whose duties included collection of taxes and supervision of the revenue, to travel widely.

<sup>20</sup> Note, for example, the dedication of the *boulē* and *dēmos* to John the Restorer: Bosch, *Quellen*, no. 306.

<sup>21</sup> The work is attested by milestones: *ibid.*, nos. 299–304, and Macpherson, *op. cit.* (*supra*, note 2), no. 2).

<sup>22</sup> See *Vita Clementis*, for the prayer, col. 833, and for the execution and burial, cols. 889–92. For Cryptus, cf. note 205 *infra*.

<sup>23</sup> For the cult of St. Plato, and for the other local saints, see H. Delehay, *Les origines du culte des martyrs* (Brussels, 1933), 156f.

Zeus. After unsuccessfully urging him to sacrifice to Apollo, the vicar had Plato led outside the city to a place called Campus and executed.<sup>24</sup>

Plato had a brother named Antiochus who also enjoyed a local cult. He was a doctor who was arrested as a Christian while curing the sick in the cities of Galatia and Cappadocia. Taken before the governor, Hadrianus, he was tortured and executed, but even at the moment of his death made a new convert and martyr; the executioner, Cyriacus, when he saw blood and milk miraculously issuing together from the Saint's headless trunk, professed Christianity on the spot and was forthwith decapitated.<sup>25</sup>

Other local martyrs are not as well attested. Julian, a native of the town of Crentius, about 20 miles northwest of Ankara, was an old man at the time of the persecution of Licinius, when he withdrew into a wooded mountain and hid in a cave with 42 companions. One day, as he went to get water, he was seen by some local pagans who were sacrificing to Hecate at a nearby temple and was taken to the governor in Ankara and executed.<sup>26</sup> Eustochius and his nephew Gaianus were natives of Lycaonia; together with the three children of the latter, they were horribly executed at Ankara by order of the vicar Agrippinus.<sup>27</sup> Other saints are associated with Ankara, but their chronology, and sometimes their very existence, is dubious.<sup>28</sup>

<sup>24</sup> Details may be found in the *Vita Platonis*, cols. 404–25, a very vague account which deals mostly with the dialogue between the Saint and the vicar and the torture and execution of the former; cf. the criticism of the tradition by J.-M. Sauget, in *Bibliotheca Sanctorum*, X, cols. 959–61.

<sup>25</sup> *ActaSS, Iul.*, IV, 25f.; *Synaxarium CP*, 821, 824f.

<sup>26</sup> *Synaxarium CP*, 41.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, 766; a town in Lycaonia, near the monastic complex now known as Bin Bir Kilise, was apparently named after Gaianus: see J. Noret, "Gaianopolis, ville de saint Gaianos?," *AnalBoll*, 96 (1972), 101–5.

<sup>28</sup> I have excluded the following, who are sometimes presented as historical martyrs of the Great Persecution: Eustathius, Theodotus (and the Seven Virgins), and Socrates. The narrative of Eustathius' gruesome sufferings (*Synaxarium CP*, 851) bears no chronology, and the name of the governor Cornelius is not helpful. The *acta* of Theodotus were once regarded as having historical and topographical value; the case was advanced in detail by the editor, P. Franchi de' Cavalieri, in *I Martirii di S. Teodoro e di S. Ariadne* (= ST, 6) (Rome, 1901), introduction, 11–16. The work was subsequently demonstrated, however, to be almost entirely legendary: H. Delehaye, "La passion de Saint Théodote d'Ancyre," *AnalBoll*, 22 (1903), 320–28. The topographical details have little conceivable relation to Ankara, for the central event of the story involves a procession from the city to a lake to bathe the images of the gods. No such lake exists near Ankara, which is situated in a region notable for its dryness. The story, if it has any basis in truth at all, may refer to Antioch, where the featured persecutor Theotecnus held office (though the lake of Antioch seems too far from the city to be readily accessible, and apparently did not even exist at this time: cf. Sir L. Wooley, *Alalakh* [Oxford, 1955], 5; R. J. Braidwood, *Mounds in the Plain of Antioch* [Chicago, 1937], 9f.), or, as is perhaps more likely, to Ancyra in Phrygia, a city located on a lake; Ancyra is mentioned only in the title of the *vita*, without specification. It has been generally accepted that Malos, described in cap. 10 and supposedly 40 miles from the city near the sources of the Halys, is to be identified with the modern town of Kalecik, which is evidently built on the site of a substantial ancient settlement: Ramsay, *op. cit.* (note 2 *supra*), 251; J. G. C. Anderson, "A Celtic Cult and Two Sites in Roman Galatia," *JHS*, 30 (1910), 163–67 (with description and justification); followed by Mitchell, *op. cit.* (note 2 *supra*), 444–46. If, however, the narrative has no reference to Ankara, there is no reason to suppose that Malos was located in Galatia (note that Ramsay ignores, and Franchi de' Cavalieri tries to explain away, the rather clear statement in the *vita* that Malos was located near the source of the Halys; that river inconveniently rises in Armenia). It is conceivable, for example, that "Halys" might be a corruption for the name of another river, such as the Hyllus which rises not far from Phrygian Ancyra. A similar, if less complex, case is presented by Socrates, a priest who is supposed to have overthrown the altar of Zeus at Ankara and to have been executed there: *Synaxarium CP*, 53, 158. This, too, has been exposed as a fable by H. Delehaye, "Sainte Théodote de Nicée," *AnalBoll*, 55 (1937), 201–25. Naturally, the authenticity of the saints here accepted cannot be guaranteed, but three of them, at least, were the object of local veneration in Late Antiquity.

The church of Ankara became one of the most important in Asia Minor. It was the seat of the metropolitan bishop of Galatia, who came to rank fourth in the hierarchy of the Orthodox Church. Ankara also enjoyed the distinction of being chosen as the site of church councils in the fourth century. Soon after the end of the persecutions, a general council was held there in 314 to deal with the problems arising from the actions of church members during the persecutions. In such a critical time, accommodation and moderation were necessary, and those who had lapsed were received back into communion with degrees of penance which reflected the reluctance, willingness, or even enthusiasm with which they had transgressed. Other provisions treated a variety of disciplinary questions.<sup>29</sup>

The years of persecution had also been a time of political confusion with several civil wars. These disturbances are attested at Ankara by a large hoard of 577 coins which was buried in or near the city in about 310.<sup>30</sup> The deposit probably reflects the insecurity of the time following the death of Galerius, when a struggle for his inheritance seemed imminent. It might also conceivably have been buried by a refugee from the Great Persecution. In any case, stability was restored by Constantine, whose reign marks the beginning of a long period of peace for Galatia and most of the other provinces of Asia Minor.

#### THE HOUSE OF CONSTANTINE

During the reigns of Constantine and Constantius II, Ankara is best known for its ecclesiastical history, since the local church was headed by two bishops who gained notoriety throughout the Empire as leaders in the Christological controversies. The secular record preserves only the slightest notices: a statue was dedicated to Constantine in Ankara by the praetorian prefect Flavius Constantius, who held office from 324 to 327, and another was set up to Constantine or Constantius II by Lucilius Crispus, vicar of Pontus. Either of these may commemorate some benefaction to the city, or even an imperial visit.<sup>31</sup> Constantius II is known to have visited Ankara on at least two occasions. On 8 March 347 he issued a law from Ankara, where he had stopped on his way to campaign against the Persians, and three years later he passed through again as he was returning to Constantinople after receiving the news of the revolt of Magnentius.<sup>32</sup> On this occasion, he was met by the aspiring young orator Themistius, who delivered a highly successful speech on Philanthropia to the Emperor. He had apparently come to Ankara fearing that his voice might not be noticed among the multitude of eloquent rhetoricians who would flock to Constantius in the capital. His efforts were well rewarded:

<sup>29</sup> For the Council of Ancyra, see C. Hefele and H. Leclercq, *Histoire des conciles* (Paris, 1907), I, 298–334.

<sup>30</sup> The hoard is tabulated and analyzed by D. Kienast, "Der Münzfund von Ankara (270–310 n. Chr.)," *Jahrbuch für Numismatik und Geldgeschichte*, 12 (1962), 65–111.

<sup>31</sup> Prefect: Bosch, *Quellen*, no. 305; vicar: R. D'Orbeliani, "Inscriptions and Monuments from Galatia," *JHS*, 44 (1924), no. 45.

<sup>32</sup> Law: *Codex Theodosianus* (hereafter *Cod. Th.*), XI.36.8.

the citizens of Ankara were so impressed by his speech that they tried to persuade him to stay and teach there, and Constantius was so pleased that he quickly promoted Themistius' career so that within a few years he was one of the most distinguished rhetoricians in the Empire.<sup>33</sup>

During the first half of the fourth century, the role of Ankara in the history of the Church was considerable, and barely missed being even greater. In late 324 or early 325 Constantine called a general council in Ankara to resolve the Arian controversy. The choice of the city is ready witness of the distinction of its church and the convenience of its location, but Ankara was not destined to be the site of the First Ecumenical Council. Within a short time, the Emperor changed his mind and moved the council to Nicaea, on the grounds that its location was more convenient for the western bishops (who had now been summoned), that its climate was more salubrious, and that it was closer to the imperial court which then met in Nicomedia.<sup>34</sup> Of these, the last reason was obviously the most important; the Emperor played a dominant part in the proceedings of the Council.

Ankara was represented at Nicaea by its bishop Marcellus, who firmly defended the Orthodox position. Unfortunately for his memory, he later fell into heresy, was deposed from his see in 336, and was replaced by Basil. Only after the decree of a council and with the support of the Pope and the western Emperor could he return to the city. The population of Ankara, however, had grown fond of their new bishop, and it was only after considerable rioting that Basil was ejected and Marcellus restored. The disturbances were violent: houses were burned, there was much fighting, and crowds stormed through the city. Nuns and priests were stripped and dragged naked to the Forum, and even the sacred Host was profaned by being hung around the necks of priests. In the meantime, the doctrines of Marcellus had spread, and the city had the dubious distinction of lending its name to the adherents of the new heresy, who came to be called Ancyro-Galatians. The triumph of Marcellus was short-lived; with the death of Constans in 350, the Arians gained the upper hand, and Marcellus was exiled, this time to disappear from history.<sup>35</sup>

Basil, the successful rival of Marcellus, was one of the most important bishops of the eastern Church in the mid-fourth century, the leader of the substantial and moderate sect of Arians which was closest to the Orthodox in doctrine. He was a native of Ankara and a doctor by profession. Like many of his medical colleagues, he was a learned man and an accomplished

<sup>33</sup> Themistius, *Or.* I, XXIII.299a; for the career of Themistius, see O. Seeck, *Die Briefe des Libanius, zeitlich geordnet* (Leipzig, 1906) (hereafter Seeck, *Die Briefe*), 293f.; and *PLRE*, s.v. Themistius 1.

<sup>34</sup> Notice of the planned council at Ankara survives only in a Syriac translation of a Greek document: H. G. Opitz, *Athanasius Werke*, III, pt. 1, *Urkunden zur Geschichte des arianischen Streites* (Berlin, 1934), no. 20.

<sup>35</sup> The career of Marcellus may be reconstructed from Socrates, I.36, II.15, 19, 21, 23, 26; Sozomen, II.33; and Theodoret, *Hist. Eccl.*, II.8, a considerably more sympathetic treatment. For the riots, see Hilary of Poitiers, frag. III.9, *PL*, 10, col. 665; cf. Athanasius, *Apol. contra Arianos*, 33, *PG*, 25, col. 304.

speaker, for the medical education of the day stressed rhetoric as much as technical training. During the years after his restoration to Ankara, where he was evidently very popular, Basil took an active part in the administration and policies of the Church in the eastern Empire and gained considerable influence with the Emperor. The details of his career reveal little about Ankara except that in 358 he celebrated the dedication of a new church there, an occasion for festivity and for a synod of the invited bishops. Two years later, when Constantius had fallen under the influence of the extreme Arians, Basil was deposed from office for various irregularities which had occurred during his administration at Ankara. He was accused of striking and seizing the papers of a priest who had been traveling through the city, of turning over numerous of his ecclesiastical adversaries to the civil authorities for punishment, and, among many less monstrous offenses, of failing to excommunicate a quack doctor who had caused the death of several people. Another of the complaints against him, which reveals much of the spirit of the time, was that the clergy whom he had traduced to provincial governors were so cruelly treated and loaded with chains that they had been forced to bribe the soldiers not to treat them too severely. Whatever the truth of these charges, which are known only from the accusations of his enemies, it is evident that the bishop of Ankara had considerable power in the city and influence throughout the Church. Basil went into exile from which, in 363, he unsuccessfully petitioned Jovian for restoration to his see; thereafter, he disappears from history.<sup>36</sup>

As a man of learning who devoted his talents to the Church rather than the state, Basil represents a phenomenon of his age, and the events of his bishopric suggest that the life of Ankara was also typical of the period: riots, corruption, and collusion between ecclesiastical and civil authorities were well known in other great cities. In Galatia, however, the civil violence was so severe that Julian could write sarcastically in 362 that the Christians should be more grateful to him than to his predecessor, for in the reign of Constantius many multitudes of heretics had been butchered in Galatia and villages destroyed, while nothing of the kind had happened in his reign.<sup>37</sup>

The short reigns of Julian and Jovian saw great activity in Ankara as the Emperors and their courts stopped there on their route between the capital and the eastern frontier. Julian had been on the throne only a few months when he left Constantinople in May 362 for Antioch, his appointed base for a major campaign against the Persians. In Galatia he made a detour southward to Pessinus to worship at the famous shrine of the Mother of the Gods, where the indifference of the inhabitants showed him that his restoration of paganism was not yet a success.<sup>38</sup> The next stop was Ankara, where Julian

<sup>36</sup> For the career of Basil, see the summary by R. Janin, in *DHGE*, with full reference to the sources; St. Jerome considered him worthy of a chapter in his *De viris illustribus*, PL, 23, col. 372; church at Ankara: Sozomen, IV.13; charges against Basil: *ibid.*, IV.24. Two of Basil's numerous works survive, one on theology and one on virginity: see Epiphanius, *Adv. Haer.*, PG, 42, cols. 425-42; and F. Cavallera, "Le 'De Virginitate' de Basile d'Ancyre," *RHE*, 6 (1905), 5-14.

<sup>37</sup> Julian, *Ep.* 52, to the People of Bostra.

<sup>38</sup> Ammianus Marcellinus, XXII.9.3-7; Julian, *Ep.* 22 *ad fin.*

stayed for some time, holding court and listening to the pleas of people who had lost their property by violence or who complained that they had unjustly been forced to serve in the local senates, an onerous burden which could easily bring financial disaster. He judged fairly but severely; unlike most emperors of the time, he rejected the testimony of slanderers and informers, but he enforced the senatorial obligations without mercy. Julian was especially concerned with the financial well-being of the Empire which was still considerably dependent on the local senates to provide public works and services. In this matter he was so severe that the petitioners, failing to find release through justice, were characteristically forced to resort to large and secret bribes to escape their unwanted obligations.<sup>39</sup> During his stay in Ankara, Julian issued laws that all teachers had to be approved by the municipal senates, that governors should ensure that adequate postal service be available to the agents of the treasury, and that governors should not begin new public works until they had completed the projects of their predecessors, with the exception of temples.<sup>40</sup> Of these the first was especially appropriate to Julian, who had recently forbidden Christians to teach, and to Ankara which had a senate notoriously fond of learning.

The memory of Julian is intimately associated with his attempt to restore paganism; at Ankara he took important measures for its success. One of the features of his program was a conscious imitation of the strengths of the Christian Church—its organization and its philanthropy. Consequently, he appointed one Arsacius to be high priest—a pagan bishop of the province—of Galatia, and gave him elaborate instructions in a letter. In order to strengthen paganism in Galatia, where it seems to have been making slow progress, he requested that all priests provide a good example to the people by attending divine worship with their families and servants, and not to disgrace their office by appearing in theaters or taverns or indulging in any shameful occupations. As we have already seen in the case of St. Clement, the Christians from an early time had organized active philanthropy of a kind which had been almost entirely unknown to paganism and had thereby gained converts and loyalty among the urban populations. Julian, therefore, instructed his priest to set up hostels for travelers and to care for the poor by regular distributions. The government would provide 30,000 bushels of wheat and 60,000 pints of wine yearly in Galatia; of this, one fifth would be given to the poor who served the priests and the rest distributed among strangers and beggars. The state thus proposed to take over the functions of the Church; the grain and wine would probably be provided from the abundant Galatian

<sup>39</sup> Ammianus Marcellinus, XXII.9.8–12.

<sup>40</sup> *Cod. Th.*, XIII.3.5, VIII.5.13, XV.1.3. None of these laws bears an indication of its place of issue, but the chronology makes Ankara the overwhelmingly probable site. The first was issued on 17 June 362, the second received in Constantinople on 20 June, and the third issued on 29 June. Julian was still in the capital on 12 May (*Cod. Th.*, XIII.3.4); he arrived in Antioch on 18 July: J. Bidez, *La vie de l'empereur Julien* (Paris, 1930), 400 note 1. A saint's life suggests that Julian left Ankara on 29 June: *Vita Basilii, ActaSS, Mart.*, III, \*14; he proceeded thence to Tarsus, and then hastened on to Antioch. A stay of about two weeks in Ankara in June would thus be entirely probable.



harvests. Julian in the same letter also urged pagan villagers to offer their firstfruits to the gods, and required the priests to keep a distance from the civil authorities: they were not to visit governors in their homes or meet them at the city gates, but were to receive them only in the temples.<sup>41</sup> In such ways the Emperor hoped to provide a firm foundation for his restored religion, but his sudden death while fighting the Persians caused the whole experiment to be aborted.

Julian is famous also as a persecutor of Christians, and his stay in Ankara produced at least one martyr, Basil, a local priest whose life contains some plausible circumstantial details.<sup>42</sup> St. Basil had already gained some notoriety by proving himself an annoyance to the Arians when they were supreme in Ankara, and as a consequence had been prohibited from preaching. When Julian came to the throne, Basil attacked the pagans so violently that he was denounced to the praetorian prefect Saturninus for stirring up a sedition. Informed of his actions, the Emperor sent two rhetoricians, Helpidius and Pegasius (whom his biographer calls "teachers of perdition"), to convert him to reason.<sup>43</sup> Although aided by a priest from Nicomedia, they had no success, and Basil was left to the personal attention of Julian. The Emperor soon arrived and was greeted on the outskirts of the city by "servants of the Devil" bearing the image of Hecate. He proceeded to the palace where he met with the leading citizens and distributed largess. On the following day he watched the spectacles which were put on in his honor, then returned to the palace and summoned the uncooperative Basil. After some fruitless discussions, Julian, disgusted with the whole affair, departed for Antioch and left Basil to be killed on 29 June 362.<sup>44</sup>

A certain Busiris was less successful in his attempt to achieve the crown of martyrdom. He was arrested by the governor of Galatia for ridiculing the pagans, tortured, and consigned to prison. After the death of Julian he was released, renounced his heresy, and lived into the reign of Theodosius.<sup>45</sup> The narrative of other persecutions inspire considerably less confidence, but may

<sup>41</sup> Julian, *Ep.* 49; cf. Sozomen, V.16.

<sup>42</sup> Note that the persecutions of Julian, here as elsewhere, seem to have been quite mild; see B. de Gaiffier, "'Sub Iuliano Apostata' dans le martyrologie romain," *AnalBoll*, 74 (1956), 5-49. He lists the saints and criticizes the tradition, showing that the association of many of the martyrs with Julian is doubtful, except when attested by other early sources.

<sup>43</sup> The statement about these two rhetoricians is one of the best indications of the accuracy of the *vita*; Helpidius and Pegasius were historical figures, both renegade Christians. Helpidius is known to have accompanied Julian on his Persian expedition, and therefore would have passed through Ankara. See *PLRE*, s.v. Helpidius 6; and T. Barnes, "Another Forty Missing Names," *Phoenix*, 28 (1974), 224-33 for the identification of Pegasius. The association of two known men with Basil does not, of course, prove that anything else in the *vita* is true; the *comes scutariorum* Frumentius is otherwise unknown, but the *hegemon* Saturninus may plausibly be identified with the praetorian prefect Saturninus Secundus Salutius, who accompanied Julian on his eastern campaign, and who set up a dedication to him in Ankara (see *infra*). It is not inconceivable that he preceded the Emperor to the city, and that he persecuted Christians there as he did, very mildly, at Antioch: see *PLRE*, s.v. Secundus 3. It had previously been suggested that Saturninus must have been a vicar of Pontus: *PLRE*, s.v. Saturninus 4, where the events are misdated to 363.

<sup>44</sup> *Vita Basilii*, *ActaSS*, *Mart*, III, \*12-\*15; cf. Sozomen, V.11, confirmation of the existence of the Saint.

<sup>45</sup> Sozomen, V.11, a narrative which concurs better with the known moderation of Julian, and suggests salutary corrections to the story of Basil.

contain some element of historical fact, however preposterous the details. St. Gemellus, for example, was a native of the territory of Climaxine, a place otherwise unknown. He was arrested and tortured and driven along the highway to a place called Edessa, also unknown in this vicinity; after further tortures, he was finally crucified. At first sight, there would seem to be nothing in this fable to attract serious attention, but a church of the holy martyr Gemellus stood in Syceon, a village about seventy miles west of Ankara, in the sixth century, showing that such a Saint did actually exist.<sup>46</sup>

One monument of Julian's stay in Ankara long survived him. The praetorian prefect Saturninius Secundus Salutius, persecutor of St. Basil, made a dedication in honor of Julian "lord of the whole world," who had defeated the barbarians from the Ocean of Britain as far as the Tigris. The inscription, which was still visible in the eighteenth century, apparently accompanied a statue of the Emperor erected while both he and the prefect were in Ankara on their way east.<sup>47</sup>

After Julian fell in the Persian expedition, Jovian began the long march back to the capital, crossing the frontier of Galatia around the middle of December 363. He was met at Aspona by a deputation of the army of Gaul announcing that they had accepted him as emperor, and soon afterward arrived in Ankara, where preparations were already in progress for the celebration of the new emperor's first consulate.<sup>48</sup> On 1 January 364 he duly assumed that office with his infant son Varronianus as colleague; the child cried and resisted being carried on the curule chair, an inauspicious omen soon to be justified.<sup>49</sup> At Ankara a deputation of the Senate of Constantinople met Jovian to congratulate him on his accession; it included Themistius, who delivered a speech to celebrate the consulship, urging religious tolerance.<sup>50</sup> Two laws were issued during the stay of the court in Ankara: one, of 28 December 363, dealt with the responsibilities of governors of different ranks, and the other, of 11 January 364, provided that those who had been found suitable to teach should practice in auditoria, thus forming a complement to the law which Julian had enacted in the same city.<sup>51</sup>

The winter of 363–64 was particularly severe on the Anatolian plateau, but the Emperor felt obliged to hasten on to the capital, and left Ankara at the end of January. Several members of the imperial retinue were left behind

<sup>46</sup> *Synaxarium CP*, 294–98; *Vita Theodori Syceotae*, ed. A. J. Festugière, SubsHag, 48 (Brussels, 1970) (hereafter *Vita Theod. Syc.*), caps. 10, 25, 142. The martyrdom of Antonius, Melanippus, and Caseina at Ankara is supposed to have taken place under Julian and the governor Agrippinus: *Synaxarium CP*, 201. In this case, it seems evident that martyrs about whom nothing was known were arbitrarily assigned to the imagined persecution of Julian. The presence of Agrippinus, a notorious persecutor at Ankara under Diocletian, shows the vagueness of the tradition.

<sup>47</sup> *CIL*, III.247, first copied by Tournefort in 1707.

<sup>48</sup> Ammianus Marcellinus, XXV.10.10; for the chronology of the march, see O. Seeck, *Regesten der Kaiser und Päpste* (Stuttgart, 1919) (hereafter Seeck, *Regesten*), 214.

<sup>49</sup> Ammianus Marcellinus, XXV.10.11; cf. Philostorgius, VIII.8.

<sup>50</sup> Themistius, *Or.* V; cf. Socrates, III.26, who incorrectly places the meeting and speech at Dadastana.

<sup>51</sup> *CJ*, I.40.5, with the date emended by Seeck, *Regesten*, 214; *Cod. Th.*, XIII.3.6, attributed incorrectly in the superscription to Valentinian and Valens, corrected by Seeck, *loc. cit.*, who, however, interprets the law as a repeal of Julian's exclusion of Christians from teaching, an assumption which does not seem warranted by its language.

to follow later: among them were Datianus, a former adviser of Constantius and one of the most influential men in the Empire who, because of his advanced age, did not care to be exposed to the weather, and the commander of the second division of targeteers, a certain Valentinian. Many others less fortunate perished on the road in Galatia because of the winter storms.<sup>52</sup> The court and army stopped for a time at the obscure station at Mnizus, issued a law to confiscate all temple property for the imperial treasury, then pushed on to Dadastana on the borders of Galatia and Bithynia. The journey from Ankara, about 100 miles, had taken two weeks. At Dadastana, on the night of 17 February, the Emperor was found dead, apparently asphyxiated by a charcoal brazier burning in his quarters.<sup>53</sup> The leaderless army marched on for another week to Nicaea, where it debated the choice of a new emperor. After much discussion, the aged Datianus wrote from Ankara to suggest the name of Valentinian, who had stayed behind with him. This choice was accepted unanimously, and Valentinian soon arrived in Nicaea to receive the acclamation of the troops.<sup>54</sup>

#### LIBANIUS AND ANKARA

Ankara gained renown in the mid-fourth century as one of the favorite cities of the great rhetorician and teacher, Libanius of Antioch, whose correspondence provides a different perspective on the life of the city by presenting the pagan ruling classes, a prosperous provincial aristocracy with which Libanius was closely acquainted and for which he felt particular affection. He wrote of his fondness for the Galatians, for whom he had done more than for others, and praised their capital, Ankara, a city which he loved as much as his own and to which, he felt, he owed a debt of gratitude.<sup>55</sup> He regarded Ankara as a city which produced people with noble natures, a place outstanding for its love of learning. His affection was so strong that when he wrote to the Senate of Ankara in 365 he claimed to consider himself as one of that assembly, whose members were lovers of the Muses and would be as long as the city existed. The senators were distinguished by their love of rhetoric and their skill in it; they flocked willingly to hear a good speaker, for contests of words attracted them as the theater did others.<sup>56</sup>

Libanius' enthusiasm for Ankara was the result of two long visits which he had made there—one of a month, the other of three—while he was teaching in Constantinople from 348 to 353.<sup>57</sup> On those occasions, he came to know the city well, established firm friendships with the members of the leading

<sup>52</sup> Philostorgius, VIII.8; Ammianus Marcellinus, XXVI.1.5.

<sup>53</sup> Ammianus Marcellinus, XXV.10.12–13, with alternative theories of the cause of Jovian's death; cf. Socrates, III.26. Law: *Cod. Th.*, X.1.8; the subscription Mediolanum was corrected to Mnizus by Seeck, *Regesten*, 214.

<sup>54</sup> Ammianus Marcellinus, XXVI.1.4; Philostorgius, VIII.8.

<sup>55</sup> Libanius, *Epistulae*, ed. R. Förster, Teubner (1921–22), nos. 728, 768, 355, 1241; on what follows, see the general discussion of P. Petit, *Les étudiants de Libanius* (Paris, 1957) (hereafter Petit), 129–33. The letters here discussed, unless otherwise indicated, were written between 355 and 365.

<sup>56</sup> Libanius, *Eps.* 756, 1517.

<sup>57</sup> *Ibid.*, *Ep.* 833; for the date of Libanius' visits, see Petit, 130 note 185.

families, and maintained such close contact that in later years their sons would come to Antioch to study with him. The relationships were based on mutual advantage as well as on friendship; in return for hospitality, Libanius, a man of great fame and influence through the eastern Empire, could obtain favors for his friends and could request help from them when needed. His abundant correspondence, which often consists of such requests, brings many individual citizens of Ankara into the light of history; most of them were cultivated men of wealth and property, pagans prominent in civic affairs and patrons of learning.

The ruling aristocracy of Ankara consisted of families closely related to each other by marriage. The head of one of them, Maximus, was extremely rich and of an old family. He had acquired his wealth by honorable means—a circumstance unusual enough for Libanius to mention it—and by 361 had retired from public life to his country estate where he lived as a gentleman farmer and hunted. He rarely came into the city, and when he did he only made his friends in the marketplace unhappy that he would leave so soon. When he retired, he gave the greater part of his fortune to his son, who thus incurred the obligation of being enrolled in the local senate and of assuming the burdensome duties which accompanied that office.<sup>58</sup> Maximus was evidently one of the most influential people in the city, for even new governors on assuming office were recommended by Libanius to present themselves to him.<sup>59</sup>

Hyperechius, the son of Maximus, was a favorite of Libanius and the object of his special attentions.<sup>60</sup> He had come to study with the great teacher when he was at Nicomedia (343–48) and continued as his pupil at Constantinople and Antioch. When this long training was finished, Libanius advised him to become an advocate in the office of the governor of Galatia, but Hyperechius decided instead on a career with the central government, which could lead to greater advancement. Libanius obligingly gave his assistance and wrote a vast number of letters during the reigns of Julian and Jovian to officials who might be able to advance the young man's career. Four successive governors of Galatia were besieged with requests to help—one of them even after he had retired from office—as were Julian, the tax assessor of Bithynia, Nicocles, a sophist of Constantinople, and high officials who merely happened to be passing through Ankara, where Hyperechius could hope to catch them. Among these were Modestus, the prefect of Constantinople who was on his way to assume his new duties; Caesarius, the count of the imperial treasury, who was traveling with the court of Jovian; and Datianus the patrician, who had been left behind when Jovian and his retinue moved on.<sup>61</sup>

<sup>58</sup> Libanius, *Ep.* 298, and Seeck, *Die Briefe*, 210f.: Maximus XII.

<sup>59</sup> Libanius, *Eps.* 298 to Acacius and 779 to Maximus, both governors.

<sup>60</sup> See *PLRE* and Seeck, *Die Briefe*, for full references and details of Hyperechius' career; it is well summarized in Petit, 162–64.

<sup>61</sup> Governors: Ecdicius: Libanius, *Eps.* 267, 1359, 1419; Acacius, *Ep.* 298, cf. *Ep.* 308; Maximus: *Ep.* 779; Leontius: *Ep.* 1267; Julian, *Ep.* 1454; Nicocles: *Ep.* 810; Caesarius: *Eps.* 1114, 1443; Modestus: *Eps.* 308, 792; Datianus: *Ep.* 1115. The requests were not all direct; although Hyperechius was advised to approach Modestus himself, the latter had been requested to intercede for him with Acacius. For full details, see Seeck, *Die Briefe*, s.v. Hyperechius and the names above.

This extraordinary effort of Libanius to use his wide-reaching influence, which was particularly strong at Ankara, was of little avail in spite of Hyperechius' connections and talent. In addition to being the scion of a rich and important family, he had also learned enough from Libanius to become a persuasive and successful speaker. When he had received the premature inheritance of his father's fortune, he became liable to assume the curial duties, which appealed to him no more than they did to most of his contemporaries. His father suggested that he seek membership in the Senate at Constantinople, which would grant him immunity from all sorts of financial obligations, and where his wealth would be of great advantage in securing influence. Libanius characteristically urged him not to follow this advice, but to seek the rewards which would come from staying in Ankara and serving his native city.<sup>62</sup> Nevertheless, thanks to his eloquence, Hyperechius escaped from the local senate by persuading it to exempt him.<sup>63</sup> This success, which showed that he was not lacking in talent, was one of the few that Hyperechius would achieve. The only position which he could gain at first was a mediocre one, secured through the influence of Modestus, under Acacius, the governor. Finally, after a long barrage of supporting letters from Libanius, in 364 he was made a *castrensis*, the officer in charge of the commander's supplies at Constantinople. Libanius wrote that his efforts were thwarted because Hyperechius had powerful enemies, but the good relations which his father had with people of the highest positions at Ankara and elsewhere makes it possible to regard this as a rhetorical complaint, and to wonder whether some defect of character did not keep him from success. In any case, he came to a bad end. In 365 his friend Procopius assumed the purple and gave Hyperechius charge of a force in Bithynia. When he faced the army of the legitimate Emperor Valens at Dadastana, his own men handed him over to the enemy and he was apparently executed soon after.<sup>64</sup>

Other friends of Libanius at Ankara were more successful. A relative of Maximus by marriage was Agesilaus, a rich decurion who had been host to Libanius during his two long stays in the city and who subsequently sent his two sons, Strategius and Albanus, to study with his former guest. Both of them had successful careers. Strategius became a leader in the council and gained the signal honor of being sent by the governor on an embassy to bear a golden crown to Jovian on his accession. Albanus planned to become a teacher of rhetoric when he returned home after his studies, but fate intervened: his father died suddenly, and Albanus took a position as advocate in the governor's court, assuming and fulfilling his curial obligations.<sup>65</sup>

Achillius, the brother or brother-in-law of Agesilaus, had been a fellow student of Libanius and had received visits from him in Ankara. He, too,

<sup>62</sup> Libanius, *Ep.* 731.

<sup>63</sup> *Ibid.*, *Eps.* 777, 803; cf. R. Pack, "Curiales in the Correspondence of Libanius," *TAPA*, 82 (1951), 176-92, for the actions of Hyperechius in a broader context.

<sup>64</sup> Ammianus Marcellinus, XXVI.8.5.

<sup>65</sup> Albanus: Seeck, *Die Briefe*, 50-52, with a discussion of the family relationships; Strategius: *ibid.*, 284.

sent his son to Antioch to study and took his civic duties so seriously that he spent a large part of his fortune for the city. Libanius wrote to the governor asking some relief for his friend.<sup>66</sup> Another host of Libanius during his days at Ankara had been Eusebius, son-in-law of Agesilaus. While visiting him, Libanius held in his arms his young son, who subsequently grew to become one of his pupils. The elder Eusebius was a skilled rhetorician, and as such was commended to the governor when he returned to Ankara in 361.<sup>67</sup> He had a brother, Olympius, to whom Libanius wrote expressing his affection for the whole family, for Ankara, and for the Galatians in general.<sup>68</sup>

All these closely related friends of Libanius were rich and influential citizens; others, though not of this great family, were also of considerable power in the city. Of them, Bosporius had been sent on the embassy to Jovian with Strategius; he seems also to have been the head of the local senate, for it was to him that Libanius wrote in 362 asking favor for another Ancyran, Achillius. This Achillius had settled in Palestine and had become a successful and popular doctor; when his father died in 362, however, he was obliged to return to his native city to assume the duties of a decurion. Libanius wrote to Bosporius asking exemption from the obligations, so that the doctor could return to his adopted country.<sup>69</sup>

Libanius profited from his popularity in Ankara by becoming the teacher of many sons of the leading families. The fathers are often known by name, if not much more, from the correspondence. Among them were Parnasius, whom Libanius had visited during his stays in Ankara; Pompeianus, whom he commended to the governor as a special friend; and Arion, whose father Agathius had been a philosopher.<sup>70</sup>

The practical effect of the network of friends which Libanius maintained is evident in the case of Aetius of Ankara and Obodianus of Antioch. The former, a rich and influential man, had studied with Libanius, then returned to his native city to become an advocate; he possessed land in Phoenicia, and was able to give his daughter a generous dowry. When Obodianus, a leading citizen of Antioch, had been sent to the capital to congratulate Julian on his accession, he fell from his horse and hurt his shoulder and was forced to stay in Ankara. There he received the hospitality and consolation of Aetius, for both were united in their acquaintance with Libanius. Naturally, when he returned to Antioch, Obodianus did not cease to praise his Galatian host to their mutual friend.<sup>71</sup> In this case, a man of Antioch could find help and sympathetic company in a strange and distant city because of the extensive connections of his famous compatriot. Although the Ancyrans were usually extremely hospitable to strangers,

<sup>66</sup> Libanius, *Ep.* 767; Seeck, *Die Briefe*, 47f.

<sup>67</sup> Seeck, *Die Briefe*, 142, s.v. Eusebius XIX and XX.

<sup>68</sup> *Ibid.*, s.v. Olympius VIII; Libanius, *Ep.* 1241.

<sup>69</sup> Seeck, *Die Briefe*, s.v. Achillios III, Bosporios; Libanius, *Eps.* 756, 1444.

<sup>70</sup> Seeck, *Die Briefe*, s.v. Parnasius II, Pompeianus IV, Arion; see the table of students in Petit, 118.

<sup>71</sup> Aetius: Seeck, *Die Briefe*, 49; *PLRE*, s.v. Aetius 2; Obodianus: Libanius, *Ep.* 733; Seeck, *op. cit.*, s.v.

a philosopher and rhetorician named Iamblichus had a different experience. While he was making a grand tour, he came to Ankara with a letter of introduction to Maximus from Libanius. He was not well received and complained to Libanius, who replied that the only reproach usually made against the people of Ankara by strangers was that they were reluctant to let them leave, but that perhaps their customs had changed because of some recent disaster.<sup>72</sup> The circumstances of this incident are totally obscure, and it may perhaps be taken to show that in the vast majority of cases the influence of Libanius was effective.

Libanius numbered among his friends not only the rich who inhabited Ankara but the powerful who ruled it; he was well acquainted with the successive governors of Galatia and had frequent correspondence with them. Ecdicius, who held office in 360–61, was a native of Ankara. Like many of his compatriots he sent his sons to study with Libanius in Antioch and typically received letters from their teacher requesting favors for Hyperechius, even years after he had left office.<sup>73</sup> His successor Acacius (361–62) was from Antioch and already acquainted with Libanius before his move to Ankara. To facilitate his stay there, Libanius suggested that he make the acquaintance of the influential Maximus, who had a promising son whom the new governor might help.<sup>74</sup> In this way the new governor, a stranger, obtained an introduction to a man of great influence in the city where he was to reside, and might in turn reciprocate the favor by providing employment to Hyperechius. This was the first of a long series of such requests which Acacius received from Libanius; finally, the young man was given a minor post on the governor's staff.<sup>75</sup> After carrying out his duties in Ankara, Acacius retired to Antioch where his son was a student of Libanius.<sup>76</sup>

The most distinguished of the governors was Maximus, a native of Palestine, who held office from 362–64. When he entered his new post in Ankara he received a letter of congratulation from Libanius, who took the opportunity to commend the rich Maximus to the new governor, and, as usual, to ask favors for Hyperechius.<sup>77</sup> Several other letters of introduction or requests for favors reached the governor from the same source. Maximus is most important, however, as a benefactor of the city. Governors of the age typically left monuments of their rule behind them; Maximus is the only one whose local building activity is recorded. His work was so extensive that Libanius remarked that Ankara could as well be called the city of Maximus as that of Midas whose birthplace it was according to legend. Maximus erected buildings of all kinds, particularly fountains and nymphaea, which were favorite constructions of the age. He was, in addition, a patron of rhetoric and education: he increased the number of teachers, instituted more contests of rhetoric,

<sup>72</sup> Libanius, *Eps.* 570, 607.

<sup>73</sup> *PLRE* and Seeck, *Die Briefe*, s.v.; Libanius, *Eps.* 267, 1359, 1419.

<sup>74</sup> Libanius, *Ep.* 298.

<sup>75</sup> For full references, see Seeck, *Die Briefe*, 182.

<sup>76</sup> Libanius, *Ep.* 1174; *PLRE*, s.v. Acacius 8; Seeck, *Die Briefe*, 36–39.

<sup>77</sup> Libanius, *Ep.* 779; *PLRE*, s.v. Maximus 19; Seeck, *Die Briefe*, 207f.

and provided greater prizes for them.<sup>78</sup> The results of these benefactions seem to have endured; it was after the term of Maximus that Libanius had occasion to praise the local devotion to learning and remark on the fondness of the Ancyrans for public debates. In spite of this generosity, evil rumors of an unspecified nature about Maximus reached the court at Antioch, and his reputation was only cleared by the eloquence of Hyperechius and the later testimony of the delegates Bosporius and Strategius.<sup>79</sup> This aid was apparently successful, for Maximus later rose to the high office of prefect of Egypt.

Galatia was governed in 364–65 by a fellow student of Libanius, the pagan sophist Leontius, previously governor of Palestine. In an age which so esteemed culture and rhetoric it was not uncommon for a writer or teacher to rise to the highest positions, and even to succeed in them. As governor of Galatia, Leontius received letters from Libanius of the usual kind asking favors for various friends, including the inevitable Hyperechius.<sup>80</sup> Since none of Libanius' correspondence of 365–88 survives, the immediate successors of Leontius are unknown, and only one later governor appears: Adelphius, who assumed office in 392 as a young man beginning a career. He had been a student of Libanius, appropriately holding office in the city with which his teacher had such close relations.<sup>81</sup>

The letters of Libanius give some insight into administration and education in a provincial capital. The question of the decurions, or local senators, was one of the most serious which faced the government. Many municipal public services depended on the generosity of senators who increasingly had to be forced to contribute their resources as the financial situation of the Empire deteriorated. This problem affected Ankara as much as other cities, as already noted in the actions of Julian and in the cases of Hyperechius and Achillius, the doctor of Palestine. But although the unwilling senators attracted attention and thus occupy a major place in the modern perception of the period, they seem to have been in a minority, at least in Ankara. Albanus, the son of Agesilaus, for example, is mentioned as willingly fulfilling his curial obligations, and Achillius, his uncle, had taken them so seriously that he had drained his resources. The majority of Libanius' acquaintances in Ankara, who evidently belonged to the curial class, seem to have been prosperous and contented.<sup>82</sup>

The late antique government encouraged the spread of learning in order to produce a supply of literate men qualified to serve in the greatly expanded administration. The activities of the governor Maximus in promoting education were thus not untypical. At Ankara, however, he was improving a favorable situation, for the city was already noted as a center of learning and had

<sup>78</sup> Libanius, *Ep.* 1230.

<sup>79</sup> Seeck, *Die Briefe*, 207.

<sup>80</sup> *PLRE*, s.v. Leontius 9; Seeck, *Die Briefe*, 195.

<sup>81</sup> Libanius, *Ep.* 1049; *PLRE*, s.v. Adelphius 3; Seeck, *Die Briefe*, 48f. I have dealt here only with the governors mentioned by Libanius; for a list of those who held office from 284 to 395, see *PLRE*, 1102, supplemented by Appendix I, *infra*.

<sup>82</sup> Albanus: Libanius, *Ep.* 1444; Achillius: *Ep.* 767; for the senators, see A. H. M. Jones, *The Later Roman Empire 284–602* (Oxford, 1864), 724–63; and cf. Pack, *op. cit.* (note 63 *supra*).



distinguished teachers. The most famous was perhaps Hellespontius, an old friend of Libanius who corresponded with him in 365. He traveled through the world in the quest of learning, and finally as an old man came to Sardis around 390. That city was a center of thaumaturgy, a system which practiced divination and miracle-working as much as rhetoric, and whose proponents were naturally not on good terms with more conventional rhetoricians and teachers such as Libanius. When Hellespontius arrived in Sardis, he became enamored of the teachings of the local philosopher Chrysanthius and regretted that he had so long lived in error without learning anything useful—or so Eunapius, a pupil of Chrysanthius and devotee of his fantastic doctrines, wrote. After a dispute with Eunapius, however, the Galatian sophist left Sardis and died in Bithynia shortly thereafter, instructing his disciple Procopius to return to Sardis and admire Chrysanthius above all.<sup>83</sup> Other local teachers seem to have been more content with traditional learning. Agathius, evidently a well-known philosopher, was a contemporary of Hellespontius but is now known only as a name. In the 360's a certain Androcles was teaching rhetoric in Ankara and sent pupils on to Libanius for more advanced study. Among the many pupils of Libanius who themselves became teachers of rhetoric two were Galatians, both named Libanius, apparently in honor of the teacher. It is not certain whether they taught in Ankara or Antioch; in any case, both died young.<sup>84</sup>

A normal education could be obtained in Ankara, but if the rich wished their sons to succeed they would send them to a famous teacher abroad, who would give them superior training and whose influence might be useful in securing them a high position. Previous to this they might study with the local professor. Libanius was the most famous teacher of the day, but he by no means had a monopoly on influence or on the affection of the Galatians. The same age produced two other famous teachers of rhetoric, both exact contemporaries of Libanius: Himerius, who practiced in Athens and taught the Church Fathers Gregory of Nazianzus and St. Basil, among others; and Themistius, who taught, wrote, and held high political office in Constantinople, but was already well known in Ankara. Himerius could boast that students came to him from the cities of Galatia, and Themistius remarked that many of his best students, those most devoted to learning, were Galatians; in addition, he praised Ankara as one of the Greek cities most learned and most devoted to oratory.<sup>85</sup> Since no correspondence survives, the students of these teachers are not known, but their existence testifies to the prosperity of Ankara and to the interest of its leading families in education and rhetoric. Of course, an education did not guarantee success; Hyperechius, who studied many years with Libanius, was unable to advance, and a certain Olympius, who had been a student with Libanius, was forced to give up rhetoric since

<sup>83</sup> Libanius, *Ep.* 461; Eunapius: *Vit. Soph.*, 504f.; for Sardis and its school, see C. Foss, *Byzantine and Turkish Sardis* (Cambridge, Mass., 1976), 22–27.

<sup>84</sup> Agathius: Libanius, *Ep.* 728; Androcles: *Ep.* 1242; the two Libanii: *PLRE*, s.v. Libanius 2.

<sup>85</sup> Himerius, *Or.* LXIX.66 (given ca. 360); Themistius, *Or.* XXIII.299a (delivered in 377/78).

it failed to provide him with an adequate living. He became instead an *agens in rebus*, or carrier of official despatches, a position which could lead to considerable advancement and profit. It was in that capacity that he frequently had occasion to pass through Ankara, where he would deliver messages from Libanius.<sup>86</sup>

The correspondence of Libanius provides valuable insight into the life of a class hardly mentioned in the other sources, the ruling aristocracy. These men, who served in the local senate or in government offices or who lived on their country estates, were almost all pagans and evidently had considerable wealth.<sup>87</sup> The sources of this wealth are rarely specified, but its existence attests to the general prosperity of the city. Many evidently profited from the opportunities which service in a venal administration offered; others had succeeded as doctors, lawyers, or teachers; some inherited large sums and estates; and a goodly number must have been involved in the trade for which the Galatians were famous. A large upper class flourished, maintaining the pagan traditions and classical learning of its ancestors and sending its children to famous pagan teachers. The influence of these men probably accounts for Julian's favorable reception and the length of his stay; Ankara was by no means run by its bishops and saints, as it might have appeared if the letters of Libanius had not survived. When they cease, effectively after 365, the fortunes of this class are no longer known, and in the following century, when detailed information is again available, the social appearance of the city was totally different.

#### FROM VALENS TO HERACLIUS

The sources for the history of the city during the two and a half centuries between the death of Jovian and the Persian invasion are much more sporadic and less detailed than those so far considered. Such is the case for most of the cities of Asia Minor; for Ankara, at least, they are sufficient to illustrate the continuing military, administrative, and religious importance of the city. The events of the beginning of this period, in particular, reveal Ankara as a major military base.

Valens, appointed ruler of the East by his brother Valentinian while the army was at Nicaea, had been on the throne for only a year and a half when he was faced with the revolt of Procopius. He received the news in October 365 at Cappadocian Caesarea and hastened to Galatia to learn the seriousness of the revolt, which so depressed him that he considered resigning the imperial power. However, urged by the encouragement of his friends, he

<sup>86</sup> *PLRE*, s.v. Olympius 6.

<sup>87</sup> Petit, 130, goes so far as to claim that all of Libanius' correspondents in Ankara were pagans, and that the letter to the Senate, *Ep.* 1517, shows that its members were entirely pagan. Although this may be true, evidence is lacking in several cases, and the rather conventional references to the daughters of Mnemosyne and Zeus (the Muses) in the letter to the Senate need not be taken to show anything, any more than the fact that the poet whom they were encouraged to receive wrote on pagan subjects. Nothing excludes the possibility that some, even many, of the senators may have been Christians.

sent two legions into Bithynia to face the usurper. At Mygdus on the Sangarius they were won over by an emotional plea by Procopius, and deserted to him. Valens nevertheless persisted and marched westward, where his efforts failed and he barely escaped capture. Leaving Bithynia in the hands of Procopius, he withdrew to Ankara, which was to be his headquarters for the winter. In these bleak circumstances, the imperial forces did gain one victory at Dadastana on the frontier of Galatia, where the hapless Hyperechius was turned over by his men without a fight. During the sojourn of the Emperor and the army in Ankara, a son was born to Valens on 18 January 366. He was called Valentinianus Galates, "the Galatian," a nickname reflecting his place of birth. In the spring Valens ventured westward once again, took Pessinus, and marched into Phrygia where he defeated and killed Procopius and resumed supreme power.<sup>88</sup> For the rest of his reign, the Emperor resided in the capital or in Antioch or fought on the Danube frontier. Naturally, in their journeys between those cities, Valens and his retinue had occasion to pass through Ankara; one such visit is marked by a law of July 371 forbidding anybody to give shelter to decurions who were seeking to avoid their compulsory public duties.<sup>89</sup>

Valens, like Constantius, was a fervent Arian and persecuted the Orthodox throughout his domains. One of his agents was the vicar of Pontus, Demosthenes, who summoned a synod at Ankara in mid-winter 375 in an effort to discredit Basil of Caesarea and Gregory of Nyssa.<sup>90</sup> After the death of Valens, the Orthodox gained supremacy under Theodosius, who had little occasion to visit the eastern provinces. Ankara, however, felt his presence in 381 when he vindicated the memory of Paul, the patriarch of Constantinople who had been deposed and executed by Constantius. The Saint's body, which had apparently been preserved in Ankara, was brought from there and enshrined in the capital.<sup>91</sup>

Under Arcadius, Ankara achieved new distinction as one of the residences of the Emperor and his court. Each year in the early summer, as the climate and humidity of the capital became insufferable, the imperial entourage would set out for the fresher upland plains of Ankara, proceeding leisurely through western Anatolia. The choice of Ankara seems to have been encouraged by Arcadius' eunuch minister Eutropius, who, early in the reign, ran an administration of such venality that provincial governorships were sold to the highest bidder; that of Galatia is duly listed among them. The regime of Eutropius was bitterly satirized by the court poet of the West, Claudian, who wrote that the procession of the unwarlike minister and his train as they returned from Ankara was so pompous that one might imagine that he had conquered

<sup>88</sup> For these events, see Ammianus Marcellinus, XXVI.7-9.

<sup>89</sup> *Cod. Th.*, XII.1.76.

<sup>90</sup> St. Basil, *Eps.* 225, 237.

<sup>91</sup> Socrates, V.9, an early source, and the only one to associate Paul with Ankara. The archbishop was exiled to Armenia and executed at Cucusus; the circumstances of the removal of his body to Ankara, which seems to have been firmly in the hands of the Arians since the accession of the bishop Basil, are unknown. The lives of Paul by Photius (ninth century) and Simeon Metaphrastes (tenth century) make no mention of Ankara; the latter, in fact, relates that the Saint's relics were brought from Cucusus, though this might be a mere inference from the place of his execution.

the Persians and drunk of the Indus. Since the government moved with the Emperor, it is possible to follow the imperial progress to Ankara for a few years by the dates of laws which were issued along the road. In 397 Arcadius was at Nicomedia in late June, at Ankara by 4 September, and back in Constantinople by 26 September. The following year he did not leave the capital before 3 July, was in Nicomedia on the 6th of that month, at Nicaea on the 12th, and at Mnizus in Galatia on the 27th; no laws were issued from Ankara, but the court presumably spent August and part of September there, returning to Constantinople before 11 October. In 399, according to Claudian, Eutropius was about to leave for Ankara in the spring of the year in which he was consul, but the annual movement had to be suspended because of a devastating revolt of the Goths in Asia Minor. For a few years it is not possible to reconstruct the imperial itinerary, but in 405 the customary pattern reappears: the Emperor reached Nicaea early, on 12 June, and was in Ankara on 10 July and 12 August, returning to the capital before November.<sup>92</sup> In general, Arcadius and his court seem to have spent most summers in Ankara, which thus became functionally the capital of the Empire. The city would have had to provide accommodation and services for the whole retinue for months at a time, but would certainly have benefited from their sojourn.

So far, Ankara has been seen as a military and administrative center, an imperial resort, a place with a highly literate upper class, and a zealous Christian community dominated by influential bishops. In the early fifth century the city appears as a center of piety and charity, since it is known primarily from the works of two Galatian Christians, Palladius and St. Nilus. Palladius was born in Galatia in the reign of Julian or Jovian, became a monk, and made extensive visits to Egypt and the Holy Land. He was made bishop of Helenopolis in Bithynia in 400, but was deposed and exiled five years later because of his partisanship for the patriarch John Chrysostom. In 412 he returned to Galatia, and subsequently became bishop of Aspona, a city southeast of Ankara on the great highway; he died before 431. Palladius is best known for his *Lausiaca History*, written around 420, a series of biographies of holy men in Egypt and elsewhere.<sup>93</sup> Less is known of his contemporary, St. Nilus, who was a native of Ankara and lived in a monastery in or near the city for many years. He appears to have spent much time in Constantinople, where he also became a disciple of Chrysostom; he died before the middle of the fifth century. Many writings of St. Nilus on monasticism and moral subjects have survived in addition to a remarkable corpus of 1062 letters, two of which are addressed to Palladius.<sup>94</sup> The works of these two holy men provide, *en passant*, much information about Ankara.

<sup>92</sup> Eutropius: Claudian, *In Eutropium*, II.97–102, cf. 416; sale of offices: *ibid.*, I.259; chronology of laws: Seeck, *Regesten*, 293, 295, 309.

<sup>93</sup> See *The Lausiaca History of Palladius*, ed. Dom Cuthbert Butler (Cambridge, 1904) (hereafter *Hist. Laus.*), for the text and details of the life of the author.

<sup>94</sup> See M. Th. Disdier, in *DTC*, XI, pt. 1 (1931), cols. 661–74, for the lives and works of Nilus and a summary of the complex discussions which have arisen about his identity and the authenticity of

In the early fifth century there were reportedly more than two thousand virgins in Ankara. Among them, the most outstanding was Magna, a chaste and ascetic woman who contributed generously to hospitals, to the poor, and to bishops on pilgrimages. Palladius wrote a short account of her, and Nilus addressed to her a treatise on voluntary poverty in 426 or 427 which further reveals that she was a deaconness.<sup>95</sup> Magna was evidently a rich woman who had devoted herself to charity; she was not alone in such actions. The ex-count Verus and his wife Bosporia were leading citizens of Ankara and so generous that they cheated their heirs by giving the income of their property to the poor and to the churches of the cities and towns. When a famine raged, they opened their own stores of grain to the poor, and in so doing converted many heretics to Orthodoxy. They themselves lived in great simplicity in the country to avoid the luxury of the city, and wore only the cheapest clothes.<sup>96</sup> The unusual name of Bosporia suggests that she might have been the daughter or at least a relative of Bosporius, the correspondent of Libanius and leader of the senate. He had been a rich pagan; the contrast between the luxurious world portrayed by Libanius and the pious asceticism of its descendants of sixty years later, when Christianity seems to have triumphed overwhelmingly in the region, is remarkable, though of course exaggerated by the differing nature of the sources.

While he was in Galatia, Palladius met an old man, Philoromus, who had spoken boldly against Julian but seems not to have suffered excessively thereby. Philoromus spent many decades in monasteries, journeyed on foot to Rome, visited the Holy Land and Egypt, and retired to Galatia, where he was still writing at the age of eighty; his works have not survived.<sup>97</sup> An unnamed monk completes the picture which Palladius presents of the pious of Ankara and its region. This monk lived with the bishop of Ankara and gave much help to the prison and the hospital. By his time, the Church had developed an extensive system of philanthropy, already the subject of imitation by Julian. One night, this monk went out to the porch of the church where a multitude of people had gathered, lying there for their daily food—a normal occurrence in all great cities, as Palladius remarked. On this occasion, one of the women was in the pangs of childbirth with no doctor to assist her; the monk obligingly delivered the baby. The same holy man would immediately sell a book if given one, saying that he could not endure to lean over a writing-tablet, since compassion drove him from studies.<sup>98</sup>

Further colorful details come from the writings of St. Nilus. Two of his letters deal with the local martyr, St. Plato, who by this time had become the patron Saint of the city. In one of them, Nilus violently reproaches the ex-

---

his works; cf. the detailed treatment of K. Heussi, *Untersuchungen zu Nilus dem Asketen* (Leipzig, 1917); see also *infra*, note 103. The works of Nilus are printed in PG, 79; the letters to Palladius are II.133 and 134, col. 256.

<sup>95</sup> Palladius, *Hist. Laus.*, 67; Nilus, cols. 968–1060.

<sup>96</sup> Palladius, *Hist. Laus.*, 66.

<sup>97</sup> *Ibid.*, 45.

<sup>98</sup> *Ibid.*, 68.

prefect Taurianus, a pagan devoted to the worship of Cronus. He had arrested some monks who had fled into the shrine of Plato for refuge, and had put them in jail; no further details are given, but there were still pagans in high office (and would continue to be until the time of Justinian) against whom the Saint might reasonably be expected to protect the faithful.<sup>99</sup> More impressive is the miracle which St. Plato performed at a great distance. A certain man of Ankara and his young son went to Mt. Sinai and entered the famous monastery. After some time, the monastery was attacked by barbarians who carried the son off into the desert, where he began to suffer terribly. The father, who had providentially taken refuge in a cave, prayed to Christ through the martyr Plato, his compatriot. His petition was directed to the right quarters, for immediately a strange horseman appeared to the son, leading a second horse on which to bear him from captivity. The son recognized Plato from often seeing his picture on icons; the Saint led him back to his father, then disappeared.<sup>100</sup> This miraculous narrative shows not only the importance of the local Saint, but also the intense loyalty to his native city which a citizen of Late Antiquity, like his classical forebears, still felt, as well as the prevalence and importance of icons at the time.

Among the works of Nilus is an encomium on an otherwise unknown holy man, Albianus, who had been born and raised in Ankara. He joined a monastery on the mountain opposite the citadel of Ankara which was administered by Leontius, later bishop of the city. Subsequently, Albianus retreated to the desert of Egypt and became a monk.<sup>101</sup> Pilgrimages to the Holy Land and to Egypt to visit the famous monks seem to have been a popular activity of Galatians; Palladius spent a great deal of time there, Philoromus visited, while Albianus and the anonymous beneficiaries of St. Plato actually took up residence in Egypt. Similarly, a Galatian named Petrus felt the call to holiness, traveled in the East, and made his home in an old tomb near Antioch, where he passed most of his life and was visited in his old age at the end of the fourth century by young Theodore, the historian of the Church.<sup>102</sup>

The letters of Nilus are addressed to a great variety of people, civil and ecclesiastical, throughout the eastern Empire; the recipients range from the Emperor Arcadius to a slave, and include bishops, priests, monks, high government officials, sophists, teachers, gold and silver workers, painters, architects, and a variety of tradesmen. Unfortunately, the content of most of the letters is so vapid that it is impossible without other information to determine what proportion of these recipients were natives or residents of Ankara.<sup>103</sup>

<sup>99</sup> Nilus, *Ep.* II.178, col. 291.

<sup>100</sup> Nilus, *Ep.* IV.62, col. 580f.

<sup>101</sup> Nilus, *Oratio in Albianum*, PG, 79, cols. 696–712; see also cols. 700, 703.

<sup>102</sup> Theodore, *Religiosa historia*, IX, PG, 82, cols. 1377–88.

<sup>103</sup> See the table of recipients, in PG, 79, cols. 59–68; and the remarks of Heussi, *op. cit.* (*supra*, note 94), 96ff. A. Cameron, "The Authenticity of the Letters of St. Nilus of Ancyra," *GRBS*, 17 (1976), 181–96, has now shown that most of the headings of the letters are forgeries.

Leontius, who presided over the monastery in Ankara, is almost certainly to be identified with the bishop of the city who held office in the time of Arcadius and zealously enforced Orthodoxy.<sup>104</sup> He dealt with the Novatians, whose sect had many adherents in the region, by the simple expedient of seizing their church and refusing to return it.<sup>105</sup> Leontius' successor Theodotus, who ruled the church from about 430 to 440, was a leading figure in the Nestorian controversy, preaching against Nestorius during the Council of Ephesus. He was a correspondent of other ecclesiastical leaders and wrote numerous sermons as well as a long exposition on the Nicene creed.<sup>106</sup>

The careers and works of these bishops and writers illustrate many aspects of Ankara in the fifth century. The religious life of the city may be further reflected in a curious inscription which deals with the Patriarch Jacob, Abgar of Edessa, and the Magi in their relationship to Jerusalem. The meaning of this fragmentary document has not been determined.<sup>107</sup> The following century was generally peaceful for the provinces of Anatolia; the emperors rarely stirred from the capital, and the Church, at least in this region, was relatively free from turmoil. It is therefore not surprising that only scattered notices of Ankara have survived.

In 452 Galatia was afflicted by the twin scourges of famine and plague provoked by a drought.<sup>108</sup> Such problems were endemic, since the agriculture of the region depended on a delicate balance of natural conditions, but there is no indication that they had yet provoked any decline in the population. On two occasions, travelers appear who had suffered accidents and were treated in Ankara. In the latter part of the century, some monks of the monastery of the Acoemeti on the Bosphorus were sailing on the Black Sea when their ship was wrecked and they were forced to return overland. When they came to Ankara, one of them fell sick, and was only saved by a miracle of the abbot, St. Marcellus, whose prayers from the monastery near the capital effected a cure.<sup>109</sup> In about 480, a traveler from the east was following the great highway when he was set upon by brigands, robbed, beaten, and left for dead near Ankara. He was found by other travelers and brought to the bishop of the city who had him taken to the hospital and treated. Since he was still

<sup>104</sup> Leontius was famous as a monk before he became bishop: Sozomen, VI.34.

<sup>105</sup> Sozomen, VIII.1.

<sup>106</sup> The works of Theodotus are published in PG, 77, cols. 1313–1431.

<sup>107</sup> For a preliminary publication, see B. van Elderen, "A New Inscription Relating to Christianity at Edessa," *Calvin Theological Journal*, 7 (1972), 5–14. The inscription can be dated by its reference to the impregnability of Edessa, which became part of the legend surrounding Abgar in the early fifth century and would have been inappropriate after the Persian conquest of the city in 609. It is preserved in the Roman baths at Ankara, but its provenance is unknown. The editor supposed that it might have been transported from Edessa, an assumption which the size of the stone renders unlikely. Even if it is from Ankara, the interpretation of the inscription is far from obvious. Perhaps it was associated with a copy of the correspondence between Jesus and Abgar, which was inscribed on walls as a protection. Prof. I. Ševčenko kindly provided reference to the inscription and explanation of the mention of Jacob; I believe he will publish it with a novel interpretation.

<sup>108</sup> Evagrius, II.6.

<sup>109</sup> *Vita Marcelli*, PG, 116, col. 729; the miracle is undated, but must have taken place before the death of the Saint which occurred in 485.

unable to use his legs after his recovery, he asked the bishop to help him continue on his pilgrimage to the stylite saint, Daniel, who lived by the Bosphorus. The bishop granted him an animal, two men, and money for his expenses.<sup>110</sup>

The reign of Zeno the Isaurian was disturbed by a series of revolts. One of them was led by Marcian, son of the western Emperor Anthemius, but he was soon defeated and exiled to Cappadocia. Shortly afterward, however, he escaped, raised a large force from the local peasantry, and marched westward to attack Ankara. The general Trocundes arrived there first and defeated Marcian, who was exiled to Isauria.<sup>111</sup> This abortive revolt is the only known occasion in Late Antiquity when Ankara was even approached by a hostile force.

During the reign of Justinian, major administrative changes affected Asia Minor. In 535 the office of vicar of Pontus was abolished and his salary was added to that of the governor of Galatia Prima (the province of Ankara), who would henceforth be given the rank of *comes* with civil and military power over the province. This measure was taken to give the administration more power to deal with troubles in the province, especially a great rise in brigandage. In the following years, however, the situation deteriorated; disorder was on the rise and the governor, although he had been given extensive powers, was unable to control the murderers and highwaymen who simply fled from him across the frontiers of the province. In 548, therefore, the earlier decree was revoked, the governor of Galatia was reduced once more to a purely civil magistrate, and the vicar of Pontus was restored with wide-ranging civil and military powers over the whole region from the Bosphorus to the frontier; his headquarters were presumably at Ankara.<sup>112</sup> Among the troops placed under his command were the corps of the Domestics and Protectors, who had originally been high-ranking staff officers with numerous duties but by this time had degenerated to an ornamental body with high pay and privileges, for which they qualified by paying heavily for entrance into the corps. A body of these stationed in Galatia, like their fellows elsewhere, felt the pinch of economy when Justinian, who suffered the perpetual necessity of raising excessive revenue to pay for his extravagant policies at home and abroad, forced them to relinquish their salaries.<sup>113</sup>

Justinian was as seriously concerned with the defense of the Empire as with its finances. In his great building activity, which affected every part of the Empire, he repaired the military highway which led through Ankara to the frontier. No work in the city is mentioned, but in western Galatia a stone bridge was built across the river Siberis near the village of Syceon, and the

<sup>110</sup> *Vita Danielis Stylitae*, cap. 87, in H. Delehaye, *Les saints stylites*, SubsHag, 14 (Brussels, 1923), 81f.

<sup>111</sup> John of Antioch, frag. 211.4, *FHG*, IV, 619; cf. Candidus Isaurus, frag. 1, *FHG*, IV, 137; and, for the events in a broad context, E. W. Brooks, "The Emperor Zenon and the Isaurians," *EHR*, 8 (1893), 209–38, esp. 219f.

<sup>112</sup> Decree of 535: Justinian, *Novel* VIII.3; decree of 548: Justinian, *Edict* VIII.

<sup>113</sup> Procopius, *Anecdota*, 24.25.



fortifications of the nearby town of Juliopolis were rebuilt.<sup>114</sup> It was presumably this highway that the pilgrim Theodosius followed on his way to Jerusalem in about 530. In the account of his journey he mentions Ankara as the site of the shrine of St. Plato the martyr, which was for him the chief attraction of the city.<sup>115</sup> By this time, the cult of the Saint had spread and a *martyrium* in his honor was built by Justinian in the capital, near the forum of Constantine; his worship had probably been brought by merchants or officials of Ankara.<sup>116</sup>

During the reign of Justinian, Galatia was considered a fit place of retirement for the last king of the Vandals, Gelimer, who was given lands there after his kingdom had fallen to the Romans in 534.<sup>117</sup> But the most important event by far for the province, and indeed for the whole Empire, was the violent outbreak of the bubonic plague, which reached Asia Minor in 542. It carried off a substantial proportion of the population and then became endemic, recurring at intervals for the next fifty years. Although not known in detail, it seems to have been the greatest disaster which the late antique state had to face, and one which did much to provoke its ultimate decline.<sup>118</sup> In Galatia, the plague struck Syceon when the local holy man, St. Theodore, was twelve years old; he was miraculously saved by an icon of Christ.<sup>119</sup> The narrative of his life and miracles will provide the framework for the remaining late antique history of Ankara.

Syceon was a village in Galatia on the great highway twelve miles from the city of Anastasiopolis and about seventy miles west of Ankara. In the village was an inn where travelers might find rest, refreshment, and entertainment; it was kept by a woman and her two daughters, all prostitutes. Business was naturally very active because of the importance of the highway, which brought imperial couriers and all sorts of government officials. One of these couriers was a certain Cosmos who one day, as he stopped at the inn, took Mary, the more beautiful of the daughters, to bed; from their union was born the future Saint.<sup>120</sup>

When the young St. Theodore was about eight years old, the women abandoned whoredom and decided to do business by the excellence of their cuisine alone. As a result, they attracted many governors and officials to their inn, and within ten years the Saint's mother had advanced so far financially and socially that she took her portion of her inheritance, moved to Ankara, the provincial capital, and made a good marriage with a leading citizen, the

<sup>114</sup> Procopius, *Buildings*, V.4; for the remains of the bridge, see Anderson, "Exploration" (*supra*, note 2), 65-67, with a plan; and Macpherson, *op. cit.* (*supra*, note 2), 111, with a photograph, pl. ix.1. It is not clear whether the road from Bithynia into Phrygia mentioned in *Buildings*, V.3.12-15, is the great highway, as seems probable, or some other.

<sup>115</sup> *Itinera Hierosolymitana*, ed. P. Geyer, CSEL, 39 (Vienna, 1898), 144.

<sup>116</sup> Procopius, *Buildings*, I.4.27.

<sup>117</sup> Procopius, *Bell. Vandal.*, IV.9.13.

<sup>118</sup> For the plague, see J. B. Bury, *History of the Later Roman Empire*, 2nd ed. (London, 1923), 62-66; for its effects, see J. Teall, "Barbarians in Justinian's Armies," *Speculum*, 40 (1965), 294-322; and E. Patalgean, *Pauvreté économique et pauvreté sociale à Byzance* (Paris, 1977), 85-92.

<sup>119</sup> *Vita Theod. Syc.*, cap. 8.

<sup>120</sup> *Ibid.*, cap. 3.

Protector David. When she died not long after, a messenger came with the news and her dowry to the young Saint, who had stayed behind in the village.<sup>121</sup> Theodore was left with the charge of his young sister, a virgin of twelve who tried to imitate him in holiness. The Saint thought it best to encourage her desire for piety, and took her to Ankara and committed her to the nuns of the convent of Petris. She became a nun herself and died three years later.<sup>122</sup> When his grandmother died several years later, she left Theodore enough money that he was able to build a large church with three apses on a hill near Syceon, with an oratory dedicated to St. Plato adjacent to it.<sup>123</sup>

Sometime later there was a recurrence of the plague in Ankara, and both men and oxen perished. The problem was so serious that the Protectors of the city sought a typically late antique remedy: they called on the holy man, and led him back with them to Ankara. Some who had daughters in the convent of the Mother of God of Beeia persuaded him to stay there and bless its inmates with his prayers and his presence. Theodore found the cure for the pestilence the same for a great city as for the remote villages of the countryside. On an appointed day the whole population of the city and the neighborhood went in procession behind the Saint who prayed to God for deliverance. His prayers were successful, Ankara was freed from the plague, and even the cattle were saved by being sprinkled with holy water which Theodore blessed. The citizens of the metropolis then brought him back to his monastery with profuse thanks.<sup>124</sup> In this scene, which was a common one and which might be repeated in the West or the East for most of the next millennium, the spirit of the Middle Ages is already evident. In the time of Julian and Libanius a veneer of classical rationality still subsisted, especially in the cities; now, two centuries later, an enormous change has taken place, and the difference between country and city, which so marked classical culture, seems to have faded as the rural, and less rational, spirit triumphed.

As the fame of St. Theodore spread, the number and rank of his visitors became more substantial. Many of them, of course, were peasants, and on numerous occasions the Saint was called to the villages to relieve drought or pestilence, drive out demons, or perform other public services. Others came from Ankara; among them was a man whose dumb son the Saint caused to speak.<sup>125</sup> But the most distinguished visitors passed through Syceon because of its location on the great highway. In 578, as he was returning from a victorious campaign against the Persians, the future Emperor Maurice stopped to consult the Saint. A holy man from the desert in the East, on his way to ask a favor of the Emperor, visited Theodore. Domentziolus, nephew of the Emperor Focas, called on the Saint during his march to the frontier to defend it against the inroads of the Persians, and became a frequent visitor as

<sup>121</sup> *Ibid.*, caps. 6, 25, 33.

<sup>122</sup> *Ibid.*, cap. 25.

<sup>123</sup> *Ibid.*, cap. 55.

<sup>124</sup> *Ibid.*, cap. 45.

<sup>125</sup> *Ibid.*, cap. 61.

his high military command caused him to pass often along the highway. An imperial secretary was cured of stomach trouble at Justinian's bridge over the Siberis, and a condemned prisoner, George of Cappadocia, who had led a revolt against Focas, was offered consolation by the Saint. The notorious consul Bonosus, a favorite of Focas, visited Theodore, but the Saint's reputation probably reached its highest point when he received the Emperor Heraclius in 613. The Saint invited the Emperor to stay for dinner, but the latter replied that he must hasten on to the frontier.<sup>126</sup> All these dignitaries were following the great highway which led through Ankara to the frontier; they necessarily stopped in the city, and their presence, by illustrating the importance of the highway, suggests that the prosperity of Ankara continued to the very end of the age.

Theodore himself also traveled on occasion, making three journeys to the Holy Land. On one of these he encountered some fellow Galatians, pilgrims or merchants. They recognized him and commended him warmly to the people of Jerusalem, who were then suffering from a drought. They had a holy man in their country, they said, who could fill the whole world with rain in a single prayer. By this time, Theodore had gained considerable notoriety as a local saint, and the Galatians, loyal to their native country, showed great pride in him, as they had earlier demonstrated for their patron Saint, Plato.<sup>127</sup>

The centralization of the late antique government required provincials to go to the metropolis to conduct important business. Consequently, when the bishop of Anastasiopolis, a city near Syceon, died in about 580, the local clergy and landowners went to Ankara to petition the archbishop Paul to appoint Theodore as their shepherd. The archbishop agreed, and the Saint was forcibly dragged from his cell and ordained in the metropolis. His tenure as bishop, although it lasted some fifteen years, was not an unqualified success; the holy man, independent of the regular church organization, could not easily adapt to its structure. After disputes with the local magnates, who had considerable influence in the administration of the church, Theodore decided to resign his office and went to Ankara with his request. The archbishop, reluctant to accept the resignation, in his turn sent to the patriarch in Constantinople for advice. When consent finally came from the capital, Theodore was freed of his cares and allowed to return to his normal existence.<sup>128</sup> He continued to work miracles in the region, saving the peasantry and others from oppression, demons, and natural disasters. During the reign of Maurice, for example, when a severe famine again afflicted Galatia, the Saint miraculously provided wheat for the villagers.<sup>129</sup>

Theodore's promotion to the bishopric illustrates some of the changes which had taken place in the life of the late antique city since the time of Liba-

<sup>126</sup> Maurice: *ibid.*, cap. 54; holy man: cap. 73; Domentziolus: cap. 120; secretary: cap. 121; George of Cappadocia: cap. 125; Bonosus: cap. 142; Heraclius: cap. 166.

<sup>127</sup> *Ibid.*, cap. 50.

<sup>128</sup> *Ibid.*, cap. 58.

<sup>129</sup> *Ibid.*, cap. 104.

nus. In the sixth century, the local senates had virtually ceased to exist and the administration of the cities was in the hands of the bishops, the clergy, and the leading citizens. In Ankara the latter seem collectively to have gained the rank of Protector. The influence of the bishop, in particular, had grown considerably, and among his many other duties he had assumed some responsibility for public works. A bridge on the road to Pessinus, about thirty miles west of Ankara, was built by the bishop Paul, perhaps the same who ordained St. Theodore.<sup>130</sup>

Another aspect of the centralization was the extensive jurisdictional power of the governor. Seemingly trivial infractions of the laws were referred to him, and he was obliged to take direct action. On one occasion, the inhabitants of a certain village approached Theodore in tears after the divine service because a slab of stone had been removed from a hillside, releasing a host of demons who had been horribly afflicting the villagers. The Saint obliged and applied the remedy which had cured the plague in Ankara. He led the villagers in procession in prayer around the town, replaced the stone in its original position, cast out the demons, and planted a cross on the site to prevent them from returning. In the meantime, the governor Euphrantas had got word of the events and surmised that the villagers were digging for treasure, an illegal activity. The governor's suspicions were probably correct: it is still a common superstition in the Turkish countryside that old stones conceal treasure, and that hills, in particular, are rich sources, as attested by the common place-name Maltepe, "Treasure Hill." The Saint successfully intervened; he wrote to the governor that the villagers had been led into their activity by the Devil, and he saved them from prosecution.<sup>131</sup> A similar instance happened in a nearby village when a farmer dug into the side of a hill and released unclean spirits who tormented the villagers. When the news reached the governor, he decided to take firm action against the farmers who had violated the law by breaking open a grave. Several of the villagers were beaten with oxhides, and the offending farmer was taken away for punishment. Once again the Saint appeared, cast out the demons, and restored peace.<sup>132</sup> These two instances, trivial in themselves, present good examples of the swift and heavy hand of late antique justice. Although the governor was more than seventy miles away, word reached him quickly because the villages in question were not far from the great highway, and he did not delay in taking appropriate action.

The biography of St. Theodore provides a remarkable and unique record of life in the neighborhood of Ankara in the twilight of the ancient world. Within a few years, this peaceful scene would be disrupted and changed forever as victorious enemy forces descended on the country. The Saint did not live to experience the coming disaster, but saw it with the eyes of prophecy.

<sup>130</sup> The bridge was three hours west of the village of Balkuyumcu; its inscription was published by W. M. Ramsay, "Inscriptions de la Galatie et du Pont," *BCH*, 7 (1883), 22 no. 11.

<sup>131</sup> *Vita Theod. Syc.*, cap. 115.

<sup>132</sup> *Ibid.*, cap. 116.

He predicted apostasy, barbarian attacks, bloodshed, captivity and destruction, desolation of the churches, and collapse of the Empire. These dire events would foreshadow the coming of Antichrist and the end of the world.<sup>133</sup> Theodore was not alone in his gloomy anticipations, nor were the fears of such pessimists unjustified. Antichrist appeared in the form of Chosroes II, King of Persia, and the ancient world soon came to an end in a bloody convulsion. By the time the Saint uttered his prediction, Maurice had been deposed and slain by Focas, and Chosroes, claiming to avenge Maurice, crossed the Roman frontiers in force to begin a war which would be more destructive than any the ancient world had seen. Before examining these disastrous events, however, it might be appropriate to review the archeological evidence for late antique Ankara which will illustrate the sources so far considered.

#### BUILDINGS AND ARCHEOLOGY

In the early eighteenth century, Ankara was a densely inhabited city occupying about the same area as its late antique predecessor; subsequently it has not ceased to grow and prosper, so that now it is a modern metropolis which sprawls far into the countryside of Late Antiquity. Under these circumstances, it is hardly surprising that the archeological record is slender. In the constant habitation and growth of the city many old buildings were naturally destroyed, and few open spaces were left where excavation could be pursued without great inconvenience. Nevertheless, some important work has been done, mostly in the northern part of the ancient city, which has provided some hints of the physical appearance of late antique Ankara. In addition, the written sources mention numerous buildings, which are listed here as some indication of the structures that were to be found in the city:<sup>134</sup>

##### Public buildings:

- \*\* The city walls (*ca.* 270; note 14)
- \* The palace (*ca.* 300, 362; notes 16, 53)
  - The praetorium (362; note 53)
  - The senate house (365; note 67)
  - The agora (343, 361; notes 36, 69)
  - A basilica where the vicar presided opposite the Temple of Zeus (*ca.* 300; note 26)
  - A basilica (?) at Cryptus (*ca.* 300)<sup>135</sup>
  - The temple of Zeus (*ca.* 300; note 26)
  - The temple of Asclepius (362; note 53)
- \* The gymnasium of Polyeidus (*ca.* 300; notes 14, 16)

<sup>133</sup> *Ibid.*, cap. 134; cf. the quotations from the time of Focas and Heraclius about the end of the world in Jones, *Later Roman Empire* (note 82 *supra*), 316f.

<sup>134</sup> The following list gives the dates for which the buildings were attested and reference to the footnotes of this work where more detailed references may be found. Those marked \* were restored, and those marked \*\* were built in Late Antiquity.

<sup>135</sup> I infer the existence of a basilica or some similar public building from *Vita Clementis*, 860, where the Saint was brought before the governor Curicius, who was presiding in a place called Cryptus.

- \* The building "of Theodotus" (*ca.* 300; note 16)
- The prison (*ca.* 300, 362, 420; notes 16, 53, 111)
- \*\* Unspecified buildings of John the Restorer and the governor Maximus (*ca.* 300, 362–64; notes 16, 78)

Public works:

- \* The aqueduct (*ca.* 300; note 15)
- \* A fountain (*ca.* 300; note 15)
- \*\* Fountains and nymphaea (362–64; note 78)

Ecclesiastical buildings:

- The cathedral church (420; note 98)
- The new church dedicated by Basil in 358 (note 36)
- Church of St. Plato (*ca.* 430; note 99)
- Church of St. Clement at Cryptus (uncertain date; note 22)
- Church of the Archangels (no date)<sup>136</sup>
- Church "of the Saints" (no date)<sup>137</sup>
- Church of the Novatians (*ca.* 403; note 105)
- Chapel of Christopher and Chariton at Cryptus (uncertain date; note 22)
- Monastery of Nilus (5th cent.; note 94)
- Monastery on the mountain opposite the citadel (*ca.* 400; note 101)
- Monastery of Attalina (*ca.* 620; note 168)
- Convent of Magna (426; note 95)
- Convent of the Mother of God of Beeia (late 6th cent.; note 124)
- Convent of Petris (late 6th cent.; note 122)
- Hospice (*xenodochion*) (*ca.* 420; note 95)
- Hospital (*nosokomeion*) (*ca.* 420, *ca.* 480; notes 98, 110)

Places:

- Campus (*ca.* 300; note 24)
- Cryptus (*ca.* 300; note 22)

Private buildings:

- Country estate of Maximus (361; note 58)

To these, of course, should be added buildings mentioned in earlier texts which would still have been standing and used in Late Antiquity, such as the theater, the amphitheater, the bath, and numerous temples.<sup>138</sup> The vast majority of these buildings has vanished without a trace, or at least cannot be identified with any surviving remains, but two are represented by important

<sup>136</sup> See the inscription of the sixth (?) century, the tombstone of Paul, "priest of the Archangels," in G. de Jerphanion, "Mélanges d'archéologie anatolienne," *MéUSJ*, 13 (1913), 289 no. 63 (hereafter Jerphanion, "Mélanges").

<sup>137</sup> *CIG*, 9258, epitaph of Theodore, priest of the saints; his church may have been dedicated to Christopher and Chariton, or to some other group of saints.

<sup>138</sup> For a list of these, see Bosch, *Quellen*, index, s.v. "Gebäude in Ankara"; cf. Erzen, *op. cit.* (*supra*, note 1), 94–100.

ruins and some others may be at least tentatively located. Archeological investigations in the city, furthermore, have revealed buildings, particularly private residences, which are not mentioned in the sources.

The city walls which were built by the unnamed benefactor in the time of famine and barbarian attack were a typical development of the period, when cities of the interior were subject to attack for the first time in centuries. At Ankara, most of the walls of the late third century have disappeared, but enough survived in modern times to suggest that their course was not much different from that of the Ottoman city walls known from old illustrations and maps.<sup>139</sup> A fragment of the line of the ancient walls was excavated near the Roman baths in the northern part of the city. The wall was 3.7 meters thick, and consisted largely of spoils; it was protected by a ditch and was built directly over the ruins of a Roman building, apparently a private house with a hot bath. Lamps and pottery found in the ruined building suggest that it was inhabited in the second and third centuries, and again only in the time of the Seljuks.<sup>140</sup> This small excavation is of great importance in providing graphic evidence for the destruction wrought by the barbarian attacks, and for the Roman response to it: parts of the city were laid in ruins, and the new wall was built directly over them; the ancient material which it incorporated no doubt came from other buildings which were ruined and abandoned.<sup>141</sup>

The most important excavated site in Ankara is that of the large Roman gymnasium at Çankırıkapı in the northern part of the city. This establishment, built in the time of Caracalla, was a typical grandiose complex composed of an extensive open exercise court, or palaestra, and an enclosed building with the usual complement of hot and cold baths, dressing and

<sup>139</sup> The course of the Roman city walls is described by E. Mamboury, in *Ankara touristique* (Ankara, 1934) (hereafter Mamboury, *Ankara*), 71 ff. The Ottoman walls were built at the end of the sixteenth century, largely of ruins of ancient buildings; for a description of their circuit, see *ibid.*, 78–82; and, for their history, S. Eyice, "Ankara'nın Eski bir Resmi," *Atatürk Konferansları*, 4 (1970), 61–124, esp. 73, 74–87 *passim*, an extremely valuable and important survey of the history of the sources for Ottoman Ankara, with especial consideration of a splendid anonymous Dutch painting of the eighteenth century, whose importance Professor Eyice was the first to recognize (I am grateful to Dr. Rudi Lindner for this reference). For the course of the Ottoman walls, see the map of Major von Vincke (1839), *apud* Mamboury, *op. cit.*, facing p. 69, and, on a larger scale, facing p. 78; also Eyice, *op. cit.*, figs. 60, 61. The walls appear in the engravings of Tournefort (1701) and Lucas (1705), as well as in the Dutch painting, all conveniently reproduced in *ibid.*, figs. 2, 3, 62. It would not be impossible for an Ottoman wall to follow the course of one a millennium older; compare the case of Pergamum, where the walls of Manuel Comnenus (built about 1170) followed those of the late third century, which had been abandoned for a comparable time: A. Conze *et al.*, *Altertümer von Pergamon*. I, *Stadt und Landschaft* (Berlin, 1912), 299–304, 307 f.

<sup>140</sup> The stretch of wall discovered was about 40 meters long; see the excavation report of M. Akok, "Ankara şehri içinde rastlanan İlkçağ yerleşmesinden bazı izler ve üç araştırma yeri," *Belleten*, 19 (1955), 316 f.; parts of the "classical" walls of the citadel, found behind the Ankara telefon santrali (*ibid.*, 310 note 2), might belong to the same system. Other traces were found between the two circuits of Byzantine walls: R. Arik, "Les résultats des fouilles faites à Ankara par la société d'histoire turque," *La Turquie kemaliste*, 21/22 (December 1937), 48 f.

<sup>141</sup> The rather scanty evidence of the excavation does not entirely preclude the possibility that the wall represents a construction of the seventh century or later, after much of the city had been destroyed by the Persians (see the following section); the pottery, however, makes assignment to the late third century far more likely. Coin finds, which might have provided substantial evidence, were never published (they are mentioned by Akok, *op. cit.*, 317).

anointing rooms, and swimming pool.<sup>142</sup> Such *thermae* were erected all over Asia Minor and other parts of the Empire in the second and third centuries. Its fate during the invasions is not certain, but it was included within the circuit of the third-century walls and shows evidence of substantial later repairs which were considerably less splendid than the original construction. The walls around the pool, for example, were originally covered with marble revetment and mosaic; when these were repaired, the marble and mosaic were removed and replaced with plaster. Similarly, in the interior of the building, many places where the mosaic was removed were filled in with plaster or crude mosaic.<sup>143</sup> Since the building has not yet been published in detail, it is not possible to extrapolate much from the repairs. They evidently show that the bath was in continued use, and that at some time the city did not have the resources or the inclination to rebuild it in its original magnificence. This would well accord with the circumstances of the age, when cities were notoriously short of funds because of the ever increasing financial demands of the central government; but lack of chronology precludes consideration of the remains in a satisfactory historical context. Valuable confirmation of the continuity of the baths through Late Antiquity, however, is provided by the coin finds from the site. These indicate considerable activity in the third and fourth centuries, some decline in the fifth and sixth, and a break in the reign of Heraclius.<sup>144</sup> A large group of very small bronze coins, "minimi," of Anastasius, all in remarkably fine preservation, may reflect some major repairs of the time or, more probably, represent a hoard buried for safekeeping.<sup>145</sup>

This bath is possibly to be identified with the gymnasium of Polyeidus named in two late antique inscriptions. The first records only that it was restored after being ruined, but the other, which contains the praise of John "the Restorer," is more specific and provides details of the reconstruction. John restored the arches of the aqueduct which stood next to the gymnasium and brought in the great volume of water that was needed; he roofed the colonnades of part of the building which had been abandoned and rebuilt its water channel; and he restored the "winter bath"—the room or rooms used in the winter, presumably because they faced south—and adorned it with marble revetment and other decoration.<sup>146</sup> From this, it is apparent that the

<sup>142</sup> The baths have never been published, but useful preliminary reports and restorations exist: K. O. Dalman *et al.*, "Archäologische Funde in Ankara 1931," *AA* (1932), 234–48 (preliminary); N. Dolunay, "Türk Tarih Kurumu adına yapılan Çankırıkapı hafriyatı," *Belleten*, 5 (1941), 261–66 (important); M. Akok, "Ankara Şehrindeki Roma Hamamı," *Dergi*, 17 (1968), 5–37 (excellent series of plans and discussion of restoration).

<sup>143</sup> Repairs: Dolunay, *op. cit.*, 264, 266.

<sup>144</sup> The coin sequence is tabulated in Appendix II; I examined the coins in the Museum of Anatolian Civilizations, Ankara, through the kind courtesy of Bay Raci Temizer, the Director, and Bay Musa Kurum, numismatist, who will publish them properly. All the coins in the Appendix were found in the excavations of 1939: they are discussed by Bosch, *Quellen*, 321.

<sup>145</sup> See Appendix II; Bosch, *loc. cit.*, mentions a hoard found in a waterpipe, but gives no indication of the coins which it contained; those of Anastasius seem by their homogeneity and condition to have formed an independent group.

<sup>146</sup> Bosch, *ibid.*, no. 306; his translation contains several misunderstandings. The word *holkos* does not mean "arcade," but "aqueduct" or "water channel," and is so used commonly in Late Antiquity, e.g., Justinian, *Novel* XXIV.3, XXV.4; and particularly a verse inscription of Miletus



gymnasium of Polyeidus was a large complex of the kind represented by the Roman baths at Çankırıkapı; perhaps they were the same structure. The colonnades of the inscription would be those of the palaestra, the "winter bath" could be some part of the complex on the south side of the palaestra, and the revetment certainly existed in the excavated building. On the other hand, a city of the size and importance of Ankara could have had more than one such establishment; only further discoveries can resolve the question.

Of the other buildings and places mentioned in the sources, few can be identified with any probability. Neither the buildings of the governor Maximus, nor the "most useful work" built by the *consularis* Minicius Florentius and commemorated on an inscription built into the citadel walls, can now be located.<sup>147</sup> The temples, government buildings, and fountains have disappeared, as have most of the churches. The site of the aqueduct, however, may be determined: it led from the east to the steep back side of the citadel, where the water was conveyed uphill by means of a stone siphon composed of large pierced blocks. These peculiar stones were reused in the east wall of the Byzantine citadel, but not elsewhere.<sup>148</sup> The place called Cryptus, where one of the governors who tried St. Clement held court and where the Saint and his followers were later buried and honored by churches and chapels, was probably at the foot of the castle hill, where the Byzantine church of St. Clement later stood. Normally, the site of a martyrdom and burial would have been outside the city walls, but the statement that the governor was presiding at Cryptus strongly suggests that it was within the city. The monastery on the mountain opposite the citadel would have been located on Mt. Tamerlane, the modern Altındağ, a barren hill which, despite its central location, was left outside the city until the time of the Republic, when a settlement of Kurds was established on it. The monastery itself probably stood on the peak of the hill facing the citadel at the Hıdırlık, where a small domed building was erected in honor of the Moslem Saint Hıdır. In the early nineteenth century, this site contained the remains of a long building constructed of large stones, which may have represented the site of the monastery.<sup>149</sup> It was, in any case, appropriate, and a common development, that a monastery

---

from the time of Justinian (*Milet*, I/9: A. von Gerkan and F. Krischen, *Thermen und Palaestren* [Berlin, 1928], 170, no. 343) which associates *holko*i of water with a bath. This meaning of *holkos* does not appear in the lexica. For the correct interpretation of the "winter bath," see J. and L. Robert, "Bulletin épigraphique," *REG*, 59/60 (1946/47), no. 207. I have supposed that the lacuna at the end of line 4, *s. . . . . si* (no indication of the number of missing letters), might be filled with *skouilōsi*, "revetment." Much work remains to be done on the inscription.

<sup>147</sup> Minicius: Bosch, *Quellen*, 291, an inscription which further exemplifies the building activities of governors of the city.

<sup>148</sup> Jerphanion, "Mélanges," 151-53.

<sup>149</sup> For Mt. Tamerlane and its modern settlement, see Mamboury, *Ankara*, 41, with the illustration on p. 86; and for the remains on its summit, W. F. Ainsworth, *Travels and Researches in Asia Minor, Mesopotamia, Chaldea, and Armenia* (London, 1842), I, 133. The Moslem holy site is discussed in Eyice, *op. cit.* (*supra*, note 139), 112 note 98. It appears in the engraving of Tournefort (1701) and Lucas (1705), in the anonymous Dutch painting of Ankara (18th cent.), and on early photographs; for these, see Eyice, *op. cit.*, figs. 2, 3, 10, 13, 62; and Mamboury, *op. cit.*, 81. For its significance, see F. W. Hasluck, *Christianity and Islam under the Sultans* (Oxford, 1929), 325, 328, 449; and the references in Eyice, *op. cit.*, 112 note 98.

should occupy ground which was of no other use. Finally, the Campus outside the city where St. Plato was executed would have been the plain west of the city beyond the marshes now represented by the Gencilik Parkı. This area has produced numerous Christian tombs and gravestones, and was still the site of a cemetery in the eighteenth century.<sup>150</sup>

Most of the surviving or excavated late antique remains cannot be identified. The former are represented by a column and a church; the latter consist mostly of private houses.<sup>151</sup> The so-called "Column of Julian" is a familiar sight in the center of the old city of Ankara. It stands 14½ meters high, and consists of a rectangular base, a horizontally fluted shaft, and a capital decorated with acanthus leaves and round blank medallions. No inscription indicates its date and purpose; the population has attributed it since the sixteenth century or earlier to the Queen of Sheba, while the more learned are responsible for the association with Julian. The latter suggestion, though more plausible, has nothing to recommend it beyond the known fact of Julian's sojourn in the city. Stylistic investigation of the capital has suggested instead that the column may be the work of the late sixth century; the occasion for its erection remains unknown.<sup>152</sup>

Of the many churches and monasteries mentioned in the sources only one survives from Late Antiquity, and this is not an original construction but the partial rebuilding of the temple of Rome and Augustus near the Column of Julian. After the prohibition of pagan worship by Theodosius, the solidly built walls of the temple were available for new uses. The interior was divided by rows of columns into three aisles, and an apse was added to the east end. The paving of the cella was removed and the floor lowered, while a crypt was excavated under the apse. At this time, or perhaps much later, arched windows were cut into the cella wall. By the time of this work, part of the building seems to have been in ruins, for the columns of the opisthodomus, which certainly would have been used had they still stood, were not incorporated into the new construction. The style of the apse, in which alternating bands of red and grey stones are used, has suggested a date in the fifth century for the transformation of the church.

Danger still lurked, however, in the stones of the pagan building, which were commonly thought to be infested with demons; to safeguard against them crosses were incised on the walls, a common practice under the circumstances. There is good reason to believe that the rebuilt temple was a monastery. An epitaph carelessly incised on the inner wall in a late antique

<sup>150</sup> See the engraving of Tournefort and the map of von Vincke (*supra*, note 139), and *infra* for the Christian remains.

<sup>151</sup> Additional archeological evidence is provided by the vast quantity of late antique fragments, mostly of marble, which have been reused in various parts of Ankara, notably in the walls. They testify to the prosperity of the city, but cannot be put to satisfactory use here, since they have not been collected and published; a few, however, are discussed and illustrated by Jerphanion, "Mélanges," 223f.

<sup>152</sup> Mamboury, *Ankara*, 189f.; Eyice, *op. cit.*, 70, 101, 110; R. Kautzsch, *Kapitellstudien* (Leipzig, 1936), 202; for local folklore associated with the column, see Hasluck, *Christianity and Islam*, 713, 749.

scrawl names a certain Hypatius, a *hegoumenos*, or abbot, no doubt of this establishment. Furthermore, the building was surrounded by a heavy wall forty meters away, which enclosed an area of about 120 by 160 meters; it has been dated by its use of alternating courses of brick and stone to the fifth or sixth century, and would have been appropriate to a monastic compound.

The name of the building is unknown. It may have been the monastery where St. Nilus lived and worked, or that of Attalina, or some other; the presence of an abbot in any case shows that it was not a convent.<sup>153</sup>

Excavations in the general vicinity of the Roman gymnasium have uncovered traces of private houses which, as might be expected from the known prosperity of the city, are somewhat luxurious. Remains of two houses were found about 300 meters southwest of the gymnasium. One had a substantial private bath measuring about 25 by 20 meters, with curving walls with large niches and heated by hypocausts. The walls were built of alternating courses of brick and stone, and were revetted on the interior with marbles of different colors. Objects found in the excavation show that the bath was of late antique construction and was in use throughout the period.<sup>154</sup> Slightly to the south a house of the fourth century with notable mosaic pavements was found but could not be investigated in detail.<sup>155</sup> These houses give a hint of the standard of living in the city; they suggest that comfort and luxury were available, and invite comparison with better known late antique sites.

Outside the walls the necropolis avoided the marshes immediately to the west and covered the terrain now occupied by the railway station and freight yards, where many Christian tombs and epitaphs have been found.<sup>156</sup> Notable among them are three mortuary constructions. One of these, built on a rise south of the station, was a rectangular building with an apse at the east end and a crypt, which alone was preserved. The building, dated to the fourth century, was a mortuary chapel which would have contained several tombs and a shrine for divine service in memory of the deceased. Such chapels were built in graveyards throughout the Empire and were specifically encouraged by a law of Theodosius.<sup>157</sup> The other constructions, found northwest of the station, were both vaulted tombs built of brick and stone. They were sealed with stone doors, contained niches for burials, and were decorated with typical frescoes of crosses, garlands, grapes, birds, and trees with fruit—representations symbolic of paradise. The style of the paintings has suggested

<sup>153</sup> D. Krencker and M. Schede, *Der Tempel in Ankara* (Berlin, 1936), 32–35; M. Restle, "Ankyra," in *RBK*, 171f.; crosses: F. W. Deichmann, "Frühchristliche Kirchen in antiken Heiligtümern," *JdI*, 54 (1939), 107; cf. Foss, *Byzantine Sardis* (*supra*, note 83), 49; inscription: Jerphanion, "Mélanges," 291 no. 67; wall: E. Mamboury, "Les parages du temple de Rome et d'Auguste à Ankara," *Türk Tarih Derg.*, 5 (1949), 96–102 with plan.

<sup>154</sup> Akok, *op. cit.* (*supra*, note 140), 324–29.

<sup>155</sup> *Ibid.*, 310 note 2.

<sup>156</sup> See Jerphanion, "Mélanges," 225f., for mention of numerous sarcophagi in the shape of jars and discussion and illustration of several vaulted brick tombs. The necropolis extended up the slope of Maltepe, the present site of the mausoleum of Atatürk.

<sup>157</sup> Dalman *et al.*, *op. cit.* (*supra*, note 142), 250–55; law of Theodosius: *Cod. Th.*, IX.17.7.

that the tombs were built in the fourth century.<sup>158</sup> The Christian epitaphs found in this graveyard and elsewhere are generally uninformative; they bear the name of the deceased, with a characteristic attribute of *doulos theou* or *pantōn philos*, and often an indictional date, which is of no use in establishing chronology since there was a new indiction every fifteen years. Most of these numerous inscriptions have been dated to the fourth–sixth centuries. A few provide some specific information: two mention churches otherwise unknown, two others indicate an occupation—a priest who was also a silver-smith, and a grave-digger—while one may be dated with some precision.<sup>159</sup>

The country estate of Maximus, the friend of Libanius, presumably lay in the environs of Ankara. Although it cannot now be identified, two buildings which have been excavated near the city may be considered for comparison. At Etiyokuşu, five kilometers to the north, a villa of several large rooms stood on a hilltop. One of the rooms was evidently a kitchen; huge clay jars were used for the storage of food, while cisterns guaranteed a supply of water. Coins from the building show that it was in use from the late third century through the late sixth or early seventh.<sup>160</sup> Another such edifice was revealed at Yalıncağ, ten kilometers south of Ankara, where the excavators discovered what seems to have been a large house with stone foundations and walls of mud brick. It had six columns on the front and faced a courtyard; coins show that it was inhabited in the third and fourth centuries.<sup>161</sup> Although few details are known of these buildings, it is not unreasonable to surmise that they represent the country estates of rich Ankarans. Besides such estates, the countryside would have been dotted with villages, and contained numerous churches and monasteries. The life of St. Theodore vividly reveals the appearance of the rural areas of western Galatia, but comparable material is lacking for the neighborhood of Ankara. Only one inscription hints that monasteries would also have existed there; found at Hacı Abdul Paşa Çiftliği, about one-half hour south of the city, it is the tombstone of the abbot of the local (unnamed) monastery.<sup>162</sup>

<sup>158</sup> See the anonymous notice, "Freskli Bizans mezarı," in *Belleten*, 3 (1939), 484; and K. Bittel and A. M. Schneider, in *AA* (1940), 595f.; cf. M. Akok and N. Pençe, "Ankara istasyonunda bulunan Bizans devri mezarının nakli," *Belleten*, 5 (1941), 617–22. For the frescoes in the context of similar works from Christian tombs of Asia Minor, see N. Firath, "An Early Byzantine Hypogaeum Discovered at Iznik," *Mélanges Mansel* (Ankara, 1974), 919–32.

<sup>159</sup> For Christian epitaphs, see Anderson, "Exploration" (*supra*, note 2), 97f.; Jerphanion, "Mélanges," 284–91, nos. 61–66; Ramsay, "Inscriptions" (*supra*, note 130), no. 10; D'Orbeliani, *op. cit.* (*supra*, note 31), 35; F. Miltner, "Epigraphische Nachlese in Ankara II," *JOAI*, 30 (1936), 27–66, nos. 30, 36, 38, 42–44, 51, 52; churches: see *supra*, notes 136, 137; silversmith: *CIG*, 9258; grave-digger: Anderson, *op. cit.*, no. 84; dated inscription: H. Grégoire, "Inscriptions historiques byzantines. Ancyre et les Arabes sous Michel l'Ivrogne," *Byzantion*, 4 (1929–30), 437–68: "L'ère d'Ancyre et Artemidore ambassadeur et cubiculaire": pp. 453–61, an epitaph apparently dated to the year 594 of the local era, equivalent to A.D. 573 (note that Grégoire was mistaken about the era used at Ankara; see the discussion in Bosch, *Quellen*, no. 133). The other inscription analyzed by Grégoire is presented as a set of verses in honor of Artemidorus, who served as an ambassador under Zeno; the text is so uncertain, however, that it seems unwise to accept Grégoire's subtle arguments or to attempt to interpret the inscription.

<sup>160</sup> Ş. A. Kansu, *Etiyokuşu Hafriyatı* (Ankara, 1940), 28, 35f., figs. 33–37. The late antique remains are not discussed.

<sup>161</sup> B. Tezcan, *Yalıncağ Village Excavation in 1962–1963* (Ankara, 1964), 15; *ibid.*, 1964 (Ankara, 1966), 12; cf. Mitchell, *op. cit.* (*supra*, note 2), 436f.

<sup>162</sup> Anderson, "Exploration," 97, no. 79.

The archeological evidence, though not extensive, illustrates and confirms that of the literary sources. It shows that the city suffered greatly in the invasions of the late third century and that it recovered and prospered for the following three hundred years. In this respect, Ankara conforms with developments known from other cities of Asia Minor. In the Aegean zone, for example, city life flourished in Late Antiquity; new public buildings and works of all kinds were erected, and old ones were rebuilt and maintained. The evidence from Ankara is not adequate to support detailed discussion, but may be taken as a valuable supplement to the literary sources and used as tangible illustration of the nature and prosperity of the city in Late Antiquity.

#### THE PERSIAN INVASION

The reign of Heraclius (610–41) with its unprecedented disasters may be taken as marking the end of Antiquity and the beginning of the Middle Ages in the eastern Mediterranean. In its early years, the Persians forces of Chosroes II ravaged Asia Minor and occupied all the provinces from Mesopotamia to Egypt. After a bloody and destructive war of over a quarter of a century, a series of brilliant campaigns brought victory to Heraclius. But the Empire had no time to recover before it was faced with a new and more persistent enemy, the Arabs, who had definitively occupied the whole Near East before Heraclius passed from the scene. In the meantime, hordes of Avars and Slavs had overrun the Balkans; only the West remained reasonably intact. These catastrophes naturally brought great change: the state was impoverished by the loss of its richest provinces, and the social and economic structure of those which remained was seriously altered. The network of cities, which had been the backbone of classical civilization since the earliest times, suffered a blow from which it never recovered. This is particularly evident in Asia Minor, where the Persian invasions seem to have been accompanied by bloodshed and destruction, and where numerous cities were ruined, abandoned, or transformed.<sup>163</sup> Ankara, because of its strategic location on the great highway, felt the full brunt of the invasions.

By the time Heraclius came to the throne, Armenia, Mesopotamia, and northern Syria had already succumbed to the Persians, leaving Asia Minor open to attack from the east and south. Before the new Emperor could face this threat, however, he had to deal with a serious revolt in Asia Minor. Comentiolus, brother of the late Emperor Focas, had returned from the eastern frontier to take up winter quarters in Ankara. He refused to recognize the authority of Heraclius and used his command of the army to gain control of an area which extended as far west as Syceon or possibly the borders of Bithynia; it is probable that he held the office of *magister militum per orientem*, commander of the army of the eastern frontier. This revolt is known from the life of St. Theodore, who lived in the midst of the events. Heraclius tried

<sup>163</sup> For the Persian invasions, with consideration of the numismatic and archeological evidence, including that of Ankara, see C. Foss, "The Persians in Asia Minor and the End of Antiquity," *EHR*, 90 (1975), 721–47.

to settle the rebellion by negotiation, and sent a monk to deal with Comen-tiolus. As he passed through Syceon, the emissary met the Saint and was reassured that the revolt was foolish and would soon come to an end. When the mission failed to accomplish its aim, Heraclius sent a far more important representative, Philippicus, who had been in command of the Persian front under Maurice. While he was observing the rebels' military movement in Bithynia, however, he was arrested and transported to Ankara; on the way, he received the blessing of the Saint. Comen-tiolus now planned to march west to attack Heraclius, but was overthrown in his turn by Justin, patrician of the Armenians, who led a force of his men and killed the rebel during the night. Peace was established, and Heraclius assumed full control over Asia Minor within a few months of his accession; the revolt seems to have taken place during the winter of 610/11. This "Patrician of the Armenians" was presumably the *magister militum per Armeniam*, an officer created by Justinian who had the duty of defending the northern stretch of the frontier. His presence at Ankara indicates that he, also, had taken up winter quarters in the city, probably because of its strategic location with easy access to threatened frontiers of Armenia and Syria. These events reveal the continuing military importance of Ankara; it is no coincidence that the two generals should retire there for the winter, nor that the usurper should make it his headquarters. The city had been an important military base for centuries, and would only gain in prominence as enemy attacks became more concentrated on the borders of Anatolia in the succeeding age.<sup>164</sup>

In the following spring, Heraclius moved on the offensive, sending the famous general Priscus to command the army at Cappadocian Caesarea. He failed, however, to prevent the city from falling into the hands of the Persians, who now penetrated for the first time the plateau of Anatolia. This blow caused widespread consternation and fear that the Persians would soon advance farther west. The villagers of western Galatia came to St. Theodore for help and were reassured that they had nothing to fear so long as he was alive. His prediction naturally was accurate, but his life soon came to an end: when he died on 22 April 613, his native province was still untouched, but disaster was near.<sup>165</sup> Heraclius set out on the great highway in January 613, stopped in Syceon to receive the blessing of St. Theodore, and proceeded to

<sup>164</sup> For the revolt of Comen-tiolus, see *Vita Theod. Syc.*, cap. 152. The importance of this source was first noted, and the revolt discussed comprehensively, by W. Kaegi, "New Evidence on the Early Reign of Heraclius," *BZ*, 66 (1973), 308-30. Kaegi, pp. 312-13 and note 11, seems surprised, however, at the importance of Ankara, and remarks that the text of Theodore of Syceon "shows its emergence as a military center early in the seventh century." In fact, as stressed many times above, Ankara was a great military center as early as the second century and maintained that role throughout Late Antiquity. Here, as so often, it is necessary to realize that the Byzantine period represents a direct, if diminished, continuity from Late Antiquity, and that many of its "innovations" trace their origins back to Justinian or earlier. Note also that the sources for military history of the provinces within the frontier is obscure. It is possible that the army, or part of it, would as a matter of course spend the winter in Ankara, as it had done in the time of Trajan (see note 2 *supra*).

<sup>165</sup> Capture of Caesarea: Sebeos, *Histoire d'Héraclius*, trans. F. Macler (Paris, 1904), 63-65; Nicephorus, *Breviarium*, ed. C. de Boor (Leipzig, 1880); *Vita Theod. Syc.*, caps. 153-55; prediction: *ibid.*, cap. 153.

Antioch, which had fallen two years before. His forces were crushed there by the Persians, and again at Issus as they withdrew. Cilicia was lost and the Taurus and Anti-taurus marked the limits of imperial power.<sup>166</sup>

In the years after these defeats, Asia Minor lay open to the Persian armies. In 615 they made a spectacular march the whole length of the country to besiege and occupy Chalcedon. In this campaign, which illustrates the collapse of the imperial defences, they probably followed the great highway and passed by Ankara. Since they seem to have aimed at a decisive defeat which would bring Heraclius to terms, they did not occupy the country through which they passed and probably left many fortified centers intact behind them. Unfortunately, these years are the most obscure of the war; the sources are almost completely silent, and the devastation of Asia Minor can only be reconstructed by using the supplementary evidence of coins and archeology.

One event, however, was of sufficient importance to be recorded by both Greek and Syrian chroniclers: the fall of Ankara in 622. The circumstances are unknown, but an oriental writer adds the significant information that the Persian general Sharbaraz killed or enslaved all the inhabitants.<sup>167</sup> In the context of this war, which was fought with appalling brutality by both sides, the fate of Ankara is altogether plausible. Many people, of course, would have fled before the Persian army arrived. Among them was Eustathius, hegumen of the monastery of Attalina, who is known from the writings of a fellow Galatian, the monk Antiochus, a native of a place called Medosaga about twenty miles from Ankara. This Antiochus, like many of his earlier countrymen, had taken up residence in the Holy Land. He had joined the famous monastery of St. Saba near Jerusalem, but was forced to withdraw from it when the Persians attacked. His surviving work consists of 130 homilies on faith and conduct, representing an abridgment of the doctrines of the Old and New Testaments. As he wrote in his prefatory epistle, these were intended for the use of Eustathius, who had written to him of his own troubles. The abbot of Ankara had been forced to wander from place to place because of the prevailing "Chaldaean storm," by which Antiochus denoted the Persian attack. He had been suffering hunger and thirst, not of bread and water but of hearing the word of God. Since he could not carry books with him where he took refuge, Antiochus offered him the scriptural abridgment for solace and utility.<sup>168</sup> This brief but valuable notice illustrates the conditions of the time; the monk had to flee from Ankara without his possessions as the Persians advanced and to take refuge where he could find it. Neither his ultimate residence nor that of Antiochus is known.

<sup>166</sup> Caesarea and Antioch: Sebeos, *op. cit.*, 65, 67; *Vita Theod. Syc.*, cap. 166.

<sup>167</sup> The date of the capture of Ankara is not certain. Theophanes, the only Greek writer to record the event, places it in the tenth year of Heraclius (x.619–x.620); his chronology of this part of the war, however, is confused, and I have followed the oriental writers, who give the date as the first year of the Hegira (vii.622–vi.623): Michael the Syrian, *Chronicle*, ed. J. B. Chabot (Paris, 1904), II, 408; *Chronicon anonymum ad annum Christi 1234 pertinens*, ed. I.-B. Chabot, CSCO, Scriptores Syri, III, 14 (Louvain, 1937), 180; Agapius of Membidj, *Histoire universelle*, ed. A. Vasiliev, PO, VIII, 198. Of these, Agapius adds the detail about massacre and enslavement.

<sup>168</sup> See the prefatory epistle of Antiochus Monachus, in PG, 89, cols. 1421–28.

The Persian troops ravaged the countryside as well as the city. A holy man named Leontius, who had been a disciple of St. Theodore, lived in a cell near a village in the vicinity of Syceon. When the Persians came, they ordered him to leave his cell and killed him when he refused.<sup>169</sup> This incident, which may have been associated with the capture of Ankara or with another passage of the Persians through the district, was probably typical of the sufferings caused by the war. Further details are lacking; the sources only record the great siege of the capital which the Persians attempted with their Avar allies in 626. This attack shows that the country was still open to their passage, but it was a final effort. Within two years, Heraclius won a remarkable victory and the Persians withdrew from Asia Minor forever. The damage they had done, however, was enormous.

The archeological record of the Persian attack is of greatest value, for the excavations of the Roman gymnasium provide a remarkable illustration of the destruction wrought by the armies of Chosroes. The building was destroyed by fire; the ruins were found covered with a layer of ashes and debris. Objects found in this debris provide unambiguous evidence for the date of the calamity: they included gold coins of Heraclius, a large jar dated to the same period, and, most outstanding, an agate ring stone apparently of Sassanian manufacture.<sup>170</sup> There can be no doubt, therefore, that the building was destroyed by Persians in 622. This is further confirmed by the sequence of coins found in the excavation. Although continuous from the third century through the early years of Heraclius, they drop off suddenly: only one coin of the late years of Heraclius (a bronze piece of 640), and two of Constans II (641–68), represent the rest of the seventh century, while only two pieces were found from the succeeding two hundred years.<sup>171</sup> The conclusion is inescapable that the gymnasium was destroyed by the Persians and not reoccupied until the Middle Byzantine period, and then only on a very small scale. The fact that one of the greatest buildings of the late antique city, in an important location within the city walls, was ruined and lay abandoned gives some suggestion of local conditions. It is possible that much of the lower town was destroyed by the Persians, who are supposed to have massacred or enslaved the population, and that subsequently Ankara did not have the resources to reconstruct on the old scale. Such is the pattern of development in major cities of the Aegean region; severe devastation by the Persians, followed by marked contraction of the city or withdrawal to an acropolis.<sup>172</sup> When information is again available, in the mid-seventh century, Ankara has made a drastic transformation from a sprawling metropolis to a heavily fortified town on a hilltop.

<sup>169</sup> *Vita Theod. Syc.*, cap. 49.

<sup>170</sup> For the destruction of the gymnasium, see the report of Dolunay, *op. cit.* (*supra*, note 142), 266; and, in more detail, Arik, *op. cit.* (*supra*, note 140), 49f.; the jar and some of the coins are illustrated, but not the ring stone.

<sup>171</sup> For the coin sequence, see Appendix II.

<sup>172</sup> I have discussed this phenomenon in the article cited *supra*, note 163, and at much greater length in *Byzantine Cities of Western Asia Minor* (Diss. Harvard University, 1972); the latter is unpublished, but will be used as a foundation for a general work on the history of the Byzantine city in Asia Minor. See also M. Hammond, "The Emergence of Mediaeval Towns: Independence or Continuity?," *HSCP*, 78 (1974), 1–33, esp. 28f.



## BYZANTINE ANKARA

The two centuries after the disastrous reign of Heraclius were marked by the unrelenting attacks of the Arabs, whose raids penetrated the fertile lands of Anatolia year after year. This constant harassment, combined with the loss of the rich provinces of the Near East which left the Empire confined to Asia Minor and parts of the West, naturally produced great changes in the military and administrative structure. It is in connection with the Arab attacks and the reorganization of the army that Ankara appears in the meager chronicles of the age.

Heraclius may have lived to see the first warriors of Islam who crossed into Asia Minor in 641.<sup>173</sup> The goal of this expedition is unknown, but it was, in any case, merely a prelude to much more serious attacks which ravaged the lands and villages of the Empire and ensured that it could never entirely recover from the Persian attack. Within five years the armies of Muawiya reached the great fortress of Amorium in Phrygia, a hundred miles southwest of Ankara, and in 654 the same general gained the far greater distinction of capturing Ankara, the first time it yielded to the advances of the Moslems.<sup>174</sup>

Until the middle of the eighth century the capital of the Caliphate was at Damascus, and the majority of attacks were launched through the Cilician Gates. This necessitated considerable strategic changes for the Empire, whose defences had been geared to attack from the Persians through Armenia or across the Euphrates. In earlier days, as already noted, the roads from the frontier converged on Ankara before leading on to the capital. Now, however, Arab forces, who had Constantinople or the rich and fertile lands of the Aegean zone as their goal, would follow the most direct route from the Cilician Gates and avoid Ankara altogether; they would proceed through the Lycaonian steppe to Pisidian Antioch to reach the west coast, or to Amorium if they aimed at the capital. Numerous raids, however, departed from Armenia or Mesopotamia and were led by the ancient road system toward Ankara. The two greatest military centers of the plateau, therefore, were Ankara and Amorium, cities within easy communication of each other and protecting respectively the northern and southern approaches to the capital. Their primacy was recognized by the Arabs, who frequently made them the goal of their greatest expeditions. In the Byzantine period, the highway system which had given Ankara its importance remained intact, supplemented and occasionally overshadowed by the southern route through Amorium.<sup>175</sup>

<sup>173</sup> For the Arab attacks, see E. W. Brooks, "The Arabs in Asia Minor (641-750), from Arabic Sources," *JHS*, 18 (1898), 182-208, a chronological series of extracts from Arab writers; and H. Ahrweiler, "L'Asie Mineure et les invasions arabes," *RH*, 227 (1962), 1-32, a considerably more theoretical treatment. See now the comprehensive survey of R. Lilie, *Die byzantinische Reaktion auf die Ausbreitung der Araber* (Munich, 1976).

<sup>174</sup> Capture of 654: F. Baethgen, *Fragmente syrischer und arabischer Historiker*, AbhKM, 8 (1884), 22 (text), 112 (translation); in the same campaign, Muawiya marched as far as Marj al Sahm in the vicinity of Amorium.

<sup>175</sup> The highway system of Anatolia remained essentially unchanged through the Byzantine period. Much confusion was typically introduced into this subject by W. M. Ramsay, who invented a Byzantine military highway which crossed the peninsula south of Ankara; see *Historical Geography* (note 2

In Late Antiquity the commanders-in-chief of the eastern armies were generals stationed on the frontier; the *magister militum per orientem*, who had charge of a vast area from the Euphrates to Egypt, and the *magister militum per Armeniam*, a new creation of Justinian who controlled the northern part of the frontier. Both these officials apparently used Ankara as their base on occasion, as in the revolt of Comentiolus. These frontier armies were supported in the interior by detachments of the *comitatenses*, commanded by the *magistri militum praesentales*, and stationed in the cities and provinces of northwest Anatolia. With the loss of the eastern provinces and with the alterations necessitated by the Arab attacks, the headquarters of these armies were moved to strategic points in the Anatolian plateau from which the troops could be mobilized to meet a threat from any direction. The general of Armenia took up his residence at Amasia, the commander of the oriental army at Amorium, and a general of the troops of the interior, the *comitatenses*, at Ankara, in a convenient central location from which communication could easily be maintained with the other armies and with the capital. The changed situation first appears in an imperial letter and an Arab account, both of the late seventh century. The letter lists the commands without specifying their headquarters, but the Arab account refers to the generals as patricians of Amorium, Ankara, and the Armeniacs.<sup>176</sup> Since Greek had become the language of the administration, the sources called commanders not by their old Latin titles of *magistri militum*, but by their Greek equivalents: two of the three generals of Anatolia thus became the *strategoi* of the Armeniac and Anatolic armies, while the commander at Ankara kept the old Latin title of *comes* of the imperial *Obsequium* (Hellenized to *Opsikion*), reflecting his origin as chief of a body of the *comitatenses*. The date of these military changes is uncertain, but since they were completed by the late seventh century and were occasioned by the Arab attacks, it is most reasonable to associate them with the reign of Constans II (641–68), when Arab raids regularly began to enter Asia Minor.<sup>177</sup>

*supra*), 197–221, esp. 214f. The evidence will be discussed by David French in a forthcoming paper on the Byzantine highway system of Asia Minor. I am grateful to Mr. French for allowing me to read his paper in manuscript.

<sup>176</sup> The imperial letter, written by Justinian II to the Pope in 687, may be found in Mansi, XI, 737, or in any discussion of the Byzantine administrative system. The Arabic document is an appendage to the list of themes, or Byzantine provinces, which Ibn Khordadbeh drew from al-Jarmi (9th cent.). Its importance was first noted by N. Oikonomides, "Une liste arabe des stratèges byzantins du VII<sup>e</sup> siècle et les origines du Thème de Sicile," *RSBN*, N.S. 1 (1964), 121–30, where sound arguments may be found for dating the document to the late seventh century. The document consists merely of a list of the twelve "patricians," or army commanders, of the Byzantines, six at Constantinople and six in the provinces. This corresponds closely with information from other sources; the provincial generals are known from the letter of Justinian II and the chronicles, and the six commanders of the capital are no doubt those which appear in later Arab and Greek writers: see H. Gelzer, *Die Genesis der byzantinischen Themenverfassung* (Leipzig, 1899), 17–19; and J. B. Bury, *The Imperial Administrative System in the Ninth Century* (London, 1911), 47–49. The Arab list does not state the headquarters of the Armeniac general; I presume that he resided at Amasia, as he did around 900: see the list of Ibn al Fakih, *apud* E. W. Brooks, "Arabic Lists of the Byzantine Themes," *JHS*, 21 (1901), 76.

<sup>177</sup> I shall discuss this date elsewhere; it is offered here as a hypothesis which accords with the known history of Ankara. It would not be appropriate here to consider the history of the Byzantine theme system, which is extremely obscure and has become the subject of much controversy. Two

Ankara is still dominated by the imposing towers of the medieval castle which crown the hill above the city center. These fortifications, the greatest work of Byzantine construction in the city, may have been a product of the military reorganization of the seventh century. They consist of two parts: an outer wall with mostly square towers about forty meters apart, and a striking inner bastion whose closely spaced pentagonal towers, only about 20 meters apart, look out over the city like prows of ships. The inner castle encloses an area of about 350 by 150 meters, while that added by the outer wall is considerably larger. The inner rampart is constructed of a façade of great blocks taken from ancient monuments up to a height of 8–10 meters, and of courses of brick above. This encloses a core of mortared rubble. The towers of the outer wall are similarly, though less neatly, constructed. The main access was from the south, where heavily fortified gateways provided access to the interior of both circuits. In addition, strong bastions were added at the southeast corner and on the highest point of the hill at the northeast, from which a magnificent view reveals the plains which stretch to the west and east of the city.<sup>178</sup>

These ramparts contain no direct evidence to date their construction; investigation has only revealed that the outer wall is later than the inner.<sup>179</sup> Historical considerations, however, have suggested a date in the reign of Constans II for the earlier walls, and this may be taken as reasonably certain. From the vast number of spoils which it contains it could only have been built at a time when much, if not most, of the city was in ruins. This would not have been the case between the reigns of Diocletian and Heraclius, but the Persian invasion of 622 would have provided such an occasion; excavation of the Roman gymnasium has already shown that parts of the lower city were then laid in ruins. If the destruction was widespread, as seems most plausible, the necessary debris would have been available for reuse in the castle. After Heraclius defeated the Persians in 628 and their troops withdrew from Asia Minor, Persia became embroiled in a series of revolts and civil wars which left it completely debilitated. The government of Heraclius, faced with the devastated provinces and the elimination of any future threat from the Persians, would probably have seen little reason to build heavy fortifications in the middle of Asia Minor. Only after the Arab raids became a regular

---

works are essential to understand the system and to avoid being seriously misled. The first, "L'origine du régime des thèmes dans l'Empire byzantin," was written by Charles Diehl in 1896, and may be found in his *Etudes byzantines* (Paris, 1905), 276–92. Although subject to revision in some details, it presents the clearest picture of the continuity of late antique military administration. Subsequently, much obfuscation was introduced into the issue; this accretion of error has been removed by J. Karayannopoulos, *Die Entstehung der byzantinischen Themenordnung* (Munich, 1959), where full bibliography may be found.

<sup>178</sup> For a convenient description of the Byzantine walls, see Mamboury, *Ankara*, 155–88, and, for a detailed discussion, Jerphanion, *Mélanges*, 144–219.

<sup>179</sup> This is shown by the fact that the lower wall begins from a projection, itself a late rebuilding, on the southeast bastion of the inner circuit: Jerphanion, *Mélanges*, 92. Mamboury, however, believed that the lower wall was the older, built by Constans II, and that the upper citadel was a product of the reign of Leo III (717–41) (see preceding note). His views have commanded little following and those of Jerphanion are generally accepted, e.g., by Restle (see *supra*, note 153).

danger, necessitating secure places of refuge for the provincial populations, would such construction have been appropriate. Ankara was captured in 654 during the first continuous onslaught of the Arabs; this may perhaps indicate that its fortifications were not yet built or completed. Subsequently, the city resisted attack for almost two centuries, although Anatolia was raided regularly; this could suggest that it was well fortified. If the citadel was built after 654, the period 656–61 would provide a suitable occasion. During these years the Arabs were embroiled in civil war, and in 659 were even obliged to pay tribute to the Emperor. The raids stopped temporarily, which gave the Byzantines a respite during which they might have constructed fortifications.<sup>180</sup>

By 661, however, the attacks began again and continued on an annual basis for twenty years. During that time, Arab armies penetrated far into Asia Minor and frequently spent the winter in Byzantine territory, so that their raids the following spring could have greater success by starting from an advanced post. In the record of these campaigns Ankara is not mentioned, but the evidence of a major find of coins suggests that Galatia was by no means spared. A hoard of 46 gold *solidi* of Constans II was buried in about 663 near the village of Cücük in the district of Çubuk, some 30 kilometers northeast of Ankara; the village lies a few kilometers north of the ancient road from Ankara to Gangra in Paphlagonia. It is probable that these coins were hidden because of a real or threatened Arab attack on the area, and their presence may provide a hint of the extent of Arab raids and of the fear which they inspired.<sup>181</sup>

In a troubled age, the chronicles naturally stress wars and the changes associated with them, but even in the darkest time of invasion and desolation the normal functions of government had to continue. The magnificent castle walls of Ankara are one symbol of the vitality of the Byzantine Empire which enabled it to survive for so many centuries against attack from east and west, but the more prosaic maintenance of an orderly central government with tight control over the provinces was the major reason for its success. Taxes were collected and remitted to the treasury, records were kept, and disbursements were made to keep the provincial administration functioning. An important part of these taxes were assessed on the importation and sale of merchandise and collected by officers called *commercarii*, who were stationed on the frontiers and at commercial centers in the interior. In the mid-seventh century

<sup>180</sup> This five-year period is the longest break in the sequence of the raids between the beginning and 681: Brooks, "Arabs" (*supra*, note 173), 184ff. Note that castles of a similar style were built during the reign of Constans II at Sardis and Pergamum, and in both cases involved considerable diminution of the area of the city: see C. Foss, "Persians" (*supra*, note 163), 737f., 742; and *idem*, *Byzantine Sardis* (*supra*, note 83), 57–59.

<sup>181</sup> For the Arab raids under Muawiya, see Brooks, "Arabs," 184–89; and for the coins, see M. Kurum, "Cücük Definesi," *TürkArkDerg.* 20 (1973), 79–90. The dating of the coins is to be revised on the basis of P. Grierson, *Catalogue of the Byzantine Coins in the Dumbarton Oaks Collection and in the Whittemore Collection*, II, 2 (Washington, D.C., 1968), 403–5: Dr. Kurum's types I, II, III, and IV should be respectively designated as IV (654–59), VI (ca. 661–ca. 663), V (659–ca. 661), and VII (ca. 663–68). As all but one of the coins belonged to the first three of these types, a date in the neighborhood of 663 seems the most likely for their burial.

such officers were posted to Ankara, which had at the same time the distinction of housing an *apotheke*, or customs depot, where goods collected as taxes in kind were stored. The direct taxes, most of which fell on the land, were collected by officials of the central treasury called *dioiketai* assigned to individual provinces; a *dioiketes* of Galatia is known from the eighth century.<sup>182</sup> The customs depot indicates that even in times of suffering from the greatest economic dislocation Ankara remained a center of trade, as it no doubt did of government. The civil governor of Galatia does not appear in the sources of the period, but the provincial administration continued to exist with little alteration through the seventh century.

During the eighth century the situation on the eastern frontier changed considerably. The Arabs presented their greatest threat in 674–78, and again in 717–18 when they besieged Constantinople. On the latter occasion they were resoundingly defeated by Leo III, who later followed up his victory by crushing the Arab forces at Acroenus (Afyon) in 740. Shortly afterward, the Umayyad caliphate of Damascus collapsed and was replaced by that of the Abbasids, who moved the capital to Baghdad. Although this gave the Empire some respite, the establishment of the new dynasty meant that the Byzantines were soon faced with a well organized and determined foe.

In the same period, important administrative changes were made which gave the generals both civil and military power in their districts, so that the old provinces disappeared and were replaced by military circumscriptions. These districts, which had originally been so large that three of them encompassed the whole of Asia Minor, were subdivided by Leo III and Constantine V. Under the latter, the general of the *Obsequium* took up new headquarters at Nicaea, and Ankara became the capital of a new province, or theme, called the Bucellarian after the *bucellarii*, troops who had been stationed in the region. The new theme stretched from the salt lake to the Black Sea and included Galatia, Paphlagonia, and eastern Bithynia. In the mid-ninth century Paphlagonia was separated to form an independent theme, and in the reign of Leo VI the Bucellarian province was further diminished by the cession of the Haymana of southern Galatia to the Cappadocian theme. In the ninth century the general of the Bucellarians was one of the highest ranking officials of the Empire. He received a salary of thirty pounds of gold and had eight thousand men under his command, most of them presumably stationed at Ankara. In addition, as the civil governor, he was in charge of a large administrative staff which included the *chartularius* of the theme, an officer responsible for the pay of the troops and at the same time subordinate to the central treasury; one *chartularius* is known from the mid-ninth century.<sup>183</sup>

<sup>182</sup> The customs officers are known from surviving lead seals which were attached to packets to show that the tax had been paid. See the tables of H. Antoniadis-Bibicou, in *Recherches sur les Douanes à Byzance* (Paris, 1963), 227; and of G. Zacos and A. Veglery, *Byzantine Lead Seals* (Basel, 1972), 172, cf. 136. For the operations of the customs and the functions of the *commercarius*, see Antoniadis-Bibicou, 157–224, 246–55, and Zacos and Veglery, 135–40. The *dioiketes* is also known from a seal: Zacos and Veglery, no. 3189.

<sup>183</sup> For the Bucellarian theme, see Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *De Thematribus*, ed. A. Pertusi (Vatican City, 1952), 71, 133–36. The transfer of southern Galatia is mentioned in Constantine

Ankara appears in the sources of this time in connection with Arab attacks. In 776 and 797 Arab forces reached Ankara but apparently did not capture it. On the latter occasion, however, they may have inflicted severe damage, for in 805 the Emperor Nicephorus fortified the city—that is, he presumably made repairs to the walls. In the following year it was approached by an army under the Caliph Harun, who reconnoitered, presumably observing the fortifications, and withdrew.<sup>184</sup> Although there is no evidence that the city fell on either of these occasions, a later legend recorded that Harun captured Ankara and took the bronze doors of the city gate back to Baghdad with him as a trophy; they were supposedly inscribed with cryptic verses in Greek of a kind which could be paralleled in the *Arabian Nights*.<sup>185</sup>

As the Arabs became familiar with Asia Minor from their incessant raids, the fame of the great fortress of Ankara spread, and its name appeared in Arabic literature and legend. One story records that when the Caliph Mamun (813–33) captured the city he found in it a statue of the great pre-Islamic Arab poet and hero Imru'l Qays. The poet had gone to Constantinople to seek the help of Justinian against his enemies and was returning home when he was killed at Ankara by a poisoned cloak which the Emperor sent him. He was buried in a tomb next to the grave of a princess at the foot of a mountain called Asib, and the Greeks eventually erected the statue in his honor. The whole story, of course, is fantastic, and is based on references in the poems of Imru'l Qays and on confusion between him and an Arab, Amorkesos, who actually visited the capital in 473. The buildings mentioned, however, are real: the tomb of the princess is the Column of Julian (for so it was called by the Turks much later), and that of the poet is probably the neighboring Temple of Rome and Augustus; the statue was no doubt some real but anonymous statue which was standing at the time.<sup>186</sup> The legend thus explained references in the poems, as well as the origin of large and probably ruined buildings which the Arabs would have seen outside the city walls. It must be of late origin, however, for Mamun, constantly preoccupied with civil war, never had occasion to capture Ankara, but his death in the Taurus after a raid on the Byzantines made him the subject of legend.<sup>187</sup>

---

Porphirogenitus, *De Administrando Imperio*, ed. Gy. Moravcsik (Budapest, 1949), 236. Numerous generals of the theme are known from seals of the eighth and ninth centuries: see Zacos and Veglery, *op. cit.*, index, s.v. *Bucellarion*; seal of *chartularius*: *ibid.*, no. 1768. For the officers of the theme, see Bury, *Administrative System* (supra, note 176), 41–45.

<sup>184</sup> Attacks of 776 and 797: E. W. Brooks, "Byzantines and Arabs in the Time of the Early Abbasids," *EHR*, 15 (1900), 735, 741; repairs: Theophanes, 481; Harun: Theophanes, 482.

<sup>185</sup> The story is transmitted by a Turkish writer of the seventeenth century, Haji Kalfa; see his *Cihannumā* (Constantinople, A.H. 1145 [= 1732]), 643; and cf. J. von Hammer-Purgstall, *Geschichte des osmanischen Reiches* (Pest, 1827), I, 160, 590.

<sup>186</sup> For the legend, see *Le divan d'Amro'l-kais*, ed. Baron MacGuckin de Slane (Paris, 1837), 27f.; and G. Olinder, *The Kings of Kinda* (Lund, 1927), 113ff.; and, for its interpretation, Hasluck, *Christianity and Islam* (supra, note 149), 712–14. Note that the Arabic authors do not all agree in associating the verses of Imru'l Qays with Ankara; for al-Harawi, for example, Mt. Asib was near Kayseri: *al-Harawī* (†1215), *Guide des lieux de pèlerinage*, ed. D. Sourdel (Damascus, 1957), 133.

<sup>187</sup> Legends of Mamun: Hasluck, *Christianity and Islam*, 301–3, 696–98.

The Caliph Mu'tasim (833–42) was far more successful in his wars against the Byzantines than had been his father Harun or his brother Mamun. In the spring of 838 he set out from Baghdad with the greatest army the Arabs had ever equipped. Its banners bore the name of Amorium, the strongest of the Byzantine fortresses and the ancestral home of the ruling dynasty. In fact, Mu'tasim's goal was double; he divided his forces so that the main army would march with him through the Cilician Gates, while another huge force commanded by Afshin would approach from the east. The two armies would meet at Ankara, which was their first goal. Mu'tasim "planned the descent upon Anqira carefully so that if God conquered it for him he could go on to 'Amuriyya, as there was nothing in the land of the Byzantines greater than these two cities, nor anything more worthy to be his goal."<sup>188</sup> The main army proceeded across the dreary Cappadocian plain until it came within three days' journey of Ankara. By then, the Arabs were suffering from shortages of water and fodder, and were forced to behead their captives until only one remained. This old man, wishing to save himself, led an Arab force up into the mountains, where the people of Ankara had taken refuge upon hearing of the approach of Mu'tasim. The Arabs found the refugees at some salt mines, defeated their resistance, and gained the needed supplies.<sup>189</sup>

Meanwhile, the Emperor Theophilus had marched east to repel the attack of Afshin, whom he met in the neighborhood of Dazimon. The Byzantine force was crushed and the Emperor fled from the field, withdrawing to Dorylaeum to await the outcome of the operations of the caliph against the two greatest fortresses of Asia Minor. Theophilus, in a last effort to preserve Ankara, sent a eunuch to guard the city and lead the resistance of the population, but he found the place deserted and was ordered to Amorium. At Ankara, Mu'tasim and Afshin joined forces as planned, and destroyed the city. The walls of the citadel were demolished and the remaining population was led into captivity.<sup>190</sup> The victorious Arabs then marched on to Amorium, burning the villages as they went; after a siege of two weeks the famous stronghold of the Christians was taken and razed, its population massacred or led into captivity. The capture and destruction of these two great centers was probably the most spectacular victory for the Arabs in their long struggle with the Empire, and it made a great impression on contemporaries.

The results of these conquests were not long lasting, and Ankara soon rose from its ashes. The degenerate successors of Mu'tasim, involved in a struggle with their Turkish generals and with uprisings throughout their wide domains, were unable to follow up the advantage which the Arabs had momentarily gained, while the Byzantines grew in strength and were soon able to move

<sup>188</sup> Quoted from *al-Tabari's The Reign of al-Mu'tasim*, trans. E. Marin (New Haven, 1951), 61; the whole campaign is narrated in *ibid.*, 60–67 (Baghdad to Ankara), 67–76 (Amorium); for detailed modern accounts with full discussions of historical and topographical problems and reference to the literature, see J. B. Bury, *A History of the Eastern Roman Empire* (London, 1912), 263–72; and A. A. Vasiliev, *Byzance et les Arabes. I, La dynastie d'Amorium* (Brussels, 1935), 144–74.

<sup>189</sup> Tabari, 64–67.

<sup>190</sup> *Ibid.*; Vasiliev, *op. cit.*, 159 note 3.

on the offensive. In 859 Michael III led an expedition to the east which reached the Euphrates. In preparation for this major move, works of fortification were carried out on major cities of the interior, and Ankara saw its walls rebuilt two decades after their destruction.

The work was commemorated by inscriptions in verse which honored the Emperor and the city. In the first of them, viewers of the restored city and its gate were invited to praise the "piously working founder of cities, the despot and faithful lord Michael, the benefactor," and to salute the city as a new Zion, inscribed with pictures painted by God. At the beginning of Michael's reign, while he was still a child, his mother Theodora had restored the reverence of icons which had been forbidden since 815. Michael could justly praise his own piety which apparently decorated the city gate with an icon of Christ. The second poem deals more specifically with the city, which it addresses. Ankara, ruined by suffering and forced to her knees by the bloody hands of the Persians, was invited to cast off her cloak of mourning, to put on a bridal dress, and to take the hand of her deliverer, the lord Michael, "charming Ankara, the most brilliant of cities, the splendor of the whole land of the Galatians." These verses would also appear to have been associated with a picture, perhaps a mosaic in a public building, of the Emperor raising Ankara, who is kneeling at his feet. The same lines remark that the city was strengthened by stones which had been trodden by God; this would indicate that miraculous stones or relics were built into the walls to give them magical protection, just as the icons of Christ guarded the weakest point, the gate. Other inscriptions reveal the date of the work, June 859, and have suggested that the future Emperor Basil I was instrumental in carrying it out.<sup>191</sup>

The reconstruction involved the south side of the inner fortress, where the huge bastion at the east corner was completely rebuilt; narrow slits for archers were built into the wall, and stones decorated with crosses were inserted above them to guarantee divine protection of the kind mentioned in the poems. At the same time the whole lower circuit may have been added, more than doubling the enclosed area of the city.<sup>192</sup> The protection was soon needed; Michael's great campaign ended in ignominious defeat, and an Arab force under Omar, the emir of Malatya, marched across eastern Asia Minor and reached the Black Sea, where they sacked the port of Amisus. After this unparalleled triumph they planned to return through Galatia and Cappadocia to the Cilician Gates. As they passed along the great highway southeast of

<sup>191</sup> These inscriptions were first analyzed and their importance indicated by Grégoire, *op. cit.* (*supra*, note 159), 437-49. The first poem is on p. 438 and the second, from which the quotation is taken, on p. 439; for the date, see 444ff. Grégoire does not make any association between the second poem and a picture, but the content seems to make this a likely supposition.

<sup>192</sup> Jerphanion, *Mélanges*, 168, 180-90, 192-97, 208-19; cf. Restle (*supra*, note 153), 175f.; but note that Theophanes, 481, specifically states that Nicephorus "built" (*ektise*) Ankara; this would seem to indicate that he might have been responsible for the construction of the lower rampart, while the work of Michael III was confined to extensive restoration. The inscriptions were found in the inner citadel and, of course, need not be taken literally to indicate that the whole castle was built or rebuilt, any more than the "destruction" by Mu'tasim would mean that it was really razed to the ground.



Ankara they were intercepted by a large Byzantine force under Petronas, uncle of the Emperor, and were utterly defeated.<sup>193</sup> This decisive victory finally gave the Empire the upper hand in the long struggle against the Arabs and enabled it to take the offensive.

Although the Byzantines had repelled the Arab threat, they were still not safe from other attacks from the east. The holy Theodora, who had been responsible for the restoration of the icons, was so moved by zeal for Orthodoxy that she carried out a great massacre and expulsion of the followers of the Paulician sect. These heretics, accused of Manichaeism by the Orthodox, had flourished in the eastern provinces of Anatolia under the iconoclastic emperors to whom their ideology was less repugnant. The survivors of the persecutions of Theodora fled across the frontier and established a state with its headquarters at Tephrike on the upper Euphrates, under the protection of the Arabs. From there they would cross the frontier like the Arabs and ravage the provinces of the Empire. On one occasion they reached the Aegean coast, and in 871 advanced on Ankara and captured it.<sup>194</sup> This was the last blow the city would suffer for the next two hundred years. The Paulicians were annihilated by Basil I in 872, and the Arabs fell back on the defensive. However, they did manage to cross into Asia Minor and inflict considerable damage. In the summer of 931 the governor of Tarsus led a far larger expedition than usual against the Byzantines. Advancing through the Cilician Gates, his force of cavalry and infantry reached Amorium where they defeated the imperial forces, captured great stores of supplies, and burned the city. From there they moved on, plundering and devastating the country and massacring or enslaving the inhabitants, until they came to Ankara. Its powerful fortifications apparently protected the city, for the Arab chronicler makes no mention of its capture. The Arabs then returned to Tarsus without encountering any resistance. Their expedition had been a great success; the value of the captives alone was 136,000 dinars.<sup>195</sup>

This triumphal progress was one of the last which the Arabs would make in Asia Minor. The Byzantine armies, under a succession of brilliant generals, moved eastward and occupied lands where no imperial force had been seen since the days of Heraclius. The reign of the Macedonian dynasty (867–1025) was the heroic age of Byzantium; resounding victories were won in the East and the West and were praised in contemporary literature. The greatest product of this literature was the epic, *Digenes Akritas*, which was woven from heroic stories often based on events of the ninth, tenth, and eleventh centuries. The hero of the poem was the son of a Byzantine princess and an Arab emir who had become a Christian. The emir was the son of Chrysoherpes, who apparently represents the Paulician leader, Chrysocheir; the action of

<sup>193</sup> For this campaign, see Bury, *Eastern Roman Empire*, 283f.; and Vasiliev, *op. cit.*, 249–56. The geographical indications of the sources are very unclear.

<sup>194</sup> Genesisius, 122.

<sup>195</sup> See the account of Ibn al-Athir, trans. A. A. Vasiliev, *Byzance et les Arabes*. II, *La dynastie Macédonienne* (Brussels, 1950), 152f.

the poem takes place in the same lands around the Euphrates where the Paulicians had been active. The poem, of course, is not historical, but contains reminiscences of actual events. Among them appears the capture of Ankara by the uncle of the emir, who has also been identified as one of the Paulician leaders. In the introduction of the poem, which consists of flat verses added by a monkish editor, Ankara appears in more prominence than the poem would justify, and with specific praise:

τὸ περίφημον καὶ μέγα κάστρον ἔτι,  
τὸ δυνατόν τε καὶ κατωχυρωμένον  
τὴν Ἀγκυραν.

"The famous and great castle, the powerful and fortified Ankara."<sup>196</sup> The city, a distinguished heroine of the long struggle with the Arabs, thus fittingly found a place in the epic which commemorated them.

Contact between the Byzantines and Arabs, of course, was not confined to warfare, although that aspect is stressed by the chroniclers. Ambassadors and other travelers crossed the frontiers, and Arabic geographic literature shows an increasing awareness of the interior of Asia Minor. The road system was of particular interest to the Arabs for obvious reasons and Ankara, because of its strategic location, is mentioned in works on geography. In the tenth century al-Muqaddasi describes the main highway from Malatya to Constantinople, with Kayseri (Caesarea in Cappadocia), Ankara, and the Sangarius listed among the intermediary points; that is the ancient military highway, which was still of central importance. Similarly, al-Idrisi, writing in the early twelfth century, lists two highways which reached Ankara: one from the Euphrates to the Dardanelles, evidently identical for the most part with the preceding, and another from Konya (Iconium) via Ankara to Paphlagonia and Amasya.<sup>197</sup> These indicate, as do the courses of the campaigns of the Arabs and Byzantines, that the road system of Anatolia, which had originally endowed Ankara with such prominence, remained essentially intact through the Middle Ages.

The Byzantine historians, like their late antique predecessors, were interested in the emperor and court, the Church, and wars on the frontier. When peace was established in Asia Minor by the great victories in the east, these writers had little occasion to mention the cities of the interior which, like Ankara, were far removed from the center of events. Consequently, the last centuries of Byzantine rule are obscure and the city appears only incidentally. In 907, when Euthymius became patriarch of Constantinople, Gabriel, the bishop of Ankara, knowing the special devotion the new patriarch felt for St. Clement, presented him with the Saint's sacred shawl; the relic had evidently been preserved in the city, probably in the church of St. Clement. Gabriel's gener-

<sup>196</sup> *Digenes Akrites*, ed. J. Mavrogordato (Oxford, 1956), lines 9-11; cf. II.77. The historical reminiscences of the epic were investigated in several studies by H. Grégoire, who pursued them with his usual ingenuity and fantasy; the introduction of Mavrogordato, pp. xxx-lxxxiv, provides a valuable summary and corrective.

<sup>197</sup> Al-Muqaddasi: E. Honigmann, "Un itinéraire arabe à travers le Pont," *AIPHOS*, 4 (1936), 270; al-Idrisi: *Géographie d'Edrisi*, trans. P. A. Jaubert (Paris, 1840), II, 309, 311f.

osity may have won him the favor of Euthymius, but when the latter was deposed in 912, the bishop of Ankara was investigated by the new patriarch, Nicholas Mysticus, for corruption and embezzlement.<sup>198</sup> A bishop of the following century did more substantial good works. In 1032 famine afflicted Cappadocia and northern Asia Minor and was followed by its usual associate, the plague. The inhabitants left their homes and fled in the direction of the capital but were met on the way by the Emperor, who gave them money and supplies and persuaded them to return. In this crisis Michael, the bishop of Ankara, did everything possible to relieve the suffering of the distressed population.<sup>199</sup> Five years later another natural disaster struck when an earthquake destroyed five villages in the Bucellarian theme; Ankara seems not to have been affected.<sup>200</sup> These casual references reveal chronic problems rarely recorded by the historians of the day. The greater part of Asia Minor lies in an earthquake zone and such disturbances are frequent, though not usually severe in the region of Ankara. Similarly, as already seen in the life of Theodore of Syceon, the agricultural basis of the economy was fragile; in a bad year crops could fail and famine and the plague could afflict the villagers. Events of this kind would have been incessant, and should be borne in mind as part of the background for the whole Byzantine period.

As long as the Empire had power on the Anatolian plateau, the Bucellarian theme with its capital at Ankara remained a major province. The provincial administration, however, continued to adapt to changing circumstances. By the eleventh century, when most of the Empire was at peace and the need for a militarized administration diminished, civil magistrates again came to take highest power in the provinces, and a *krites*, or judge, appeared as the provincial governor. Such officials are known for the Bucellarian theme in the eleventh century; one of them received a letter from Michael Psellus, asking favor for the *dioiketes* of Ankara who needed assistance in collecting the taxes.<sup>201</sup> For a brief moment, the world of Libanius almost seems to have been resuscitated. Civil magistrates were once again in charge of rich and peaceful provinces, and a famous writer and statesman corresponded with high officials and asked favor from them.

The last acts of the long drama of Byzantine Ankara are veiled in obscurity. After the battle of Manzikert in 1071 the Turks overran Anatolia with astonishing rapidity. A few heavily fortified cities held out as the countryside became Turkish. When the future Emperor Alexius Comnenus made an expedition to central Anatolia in 1073, he had to fight his way wherever he went. After his brother Isaac was captured in a skirmish in Cappadocia, Alexius set out to find him, and came to Ankara where rumor claimed that Isaac was safe. On his arrival Alexius found that the report was false, but he

<sup>198</sup> *Vita Euthymii*, ed. P. Karlin-Hayter (Brussels, 1970), 105, 123.

<sup>199</sup> Cedrenus, II.499f.

<sup>200</sup> *Ibid.*, II.513f.

<sup>201</sup> Michael Psellus, *Ep.* 83, ed. E. Kurtz (Milan, 1941); for *kritai* of the period, see the lead seals in V. Laurent, *La collection C. Orghidan* (Paris, 1952), nos. 199, 200.

did use the city as a base for gathering information, and determined that his brother was being held for ransom by the Turks. On receiving this news he left for the capital to raise the necessary money and quickly returned to Ankara. When he appeared at the city gates, he found them shut because it was night, and demanded that they be opened to him. The guards, however, feared to do this because the Turks were camped somewhere in the neighborhood, and asked Alexius to identify himself. As he answered, his voice was heard by Isaac who had in the meanwhile been ransomed by the cities of the region, arriving in Ankara the same day as Alexius, and who was staying in the gate house guarding the keys to the city. Isaac opened the gates and joyfully admitted Alexius and his party. The two brothers stayed in the city three days to rest themselves and their horses, and then returned to Constantinople.<sup>202</sup>

This account of Alexius Comnenus and his brother is the last mention of Ankara before its capture by the Seljuks. The Turkish forces, already feared by the garrison, soon advanced and occupied the city, probably in the decade of confusion and civil war following Manzikert. Byzantine rule, however, had one curious and brief aftermath. In the spring of 1101 a crusading army crossed into Anatolia, and on 23 June arrived safely in Ankara, which they found in the hands of the Turks. The crusaders easily defeated the small Turkish garrison, took the city, and duly restored it to the Emperor according to their agreement. They then advanced into Paphlagonia, where they met with complete disaster. A second party of crusaders followed just behind, reaching Ankara soon after the first had left. Although the two groups had planned to join forces, the new arrivals abandoned the effort when they saw that their fellows had crossed into the mountains of Paphlagonia, and instead turned southward to Iconium; they, too, were completely defeated.<sup>203</sup> These events are the last in the history of Byzantine Ankara. The imperial forces could not hold out long in the recaptured citadel surrounded by enemy territory, especially since the main Byzantine effort was directed not toward central Anatolia but to the west and south. Probably within a few years, Ankara was again taken by the Seljuks, and it has remained a Turkish city ever since.<sup>204</sup>

The archeological record of Byzantine Ankara, like that of many other cities in Asia Minor, is exiguous. The greatest monument, the fortifications of the city, has already been considered. Outstanding also was the small church of St. Clement at the foot of the southwest slope of the citadel hill. This elegant building, only 23 by 14 meters in size, was a domed basilica with a cruciform interior plan, galleries, a narthex, and an apse with a polygonal exterior. The interior was decorated with geometric and floral designs, and the

<sup>202</sup> Nicephorus Bryennius, 64–66.

<sup>203</sup> For the Crusade of 1101 at Ankara, see the accounts of Albert of Aix, in *Recueil des historiens des croisades. Historiens occidentaux*, V, pt. 2 (Paris, 1895), 564, 575; and Anna Comnena, XI.8; cf. J. L. Cate, in *A History of the Crusades*, ed. K. Setton (Philadelphia, 1958), 354f.

<sup>204</sup> For the Turkish capture of Ankara and its subsequent history until the Ottoman conquest, see Wittek, *op. cit.* (*supra*, note 1), 338–54.

outside with regular courses of brick and stone. No document has survived to date the church; stylistic comparison has suggested the seventh, eighth, or ninth centuries, while historical considerations might favor a date late in that long period. Since the church was built outside the citadel walls, its construction would seem more appropriate to a time when the city enjoyed some security, perhaps in the reign of Michael III or later. If it was indeed built at Cryptus, the site of the martyrdom of St. Clement, the church probably occupied the site of one or more earlier shrines.<sup>205</sup>

Other archeological data suggest that Ankara recovered and prospered in the two centuries after the defeat of the Arabs by Michael III. Finds of coins and pottery at the Roman baths, ruined since the Persian invasion, indicate some reoccupation from the reign of Leo VI (886–912) through that of Romanus Diogenes (1067–71). Similarly, an inscription on the wall of the cella of the temple of Rome and Augustus suggests that the monastery which had functioned there in Late Antiquity was again in operation. This inscription, a wordy set of verses, reveals by the initial letters of each line the name of Eustathius, a *turmarch*, the highest military commander after the general.<sup>206</sup> In it, he prays to God for redemption from his sins. The verses have been dated to the ninth or tenth centuries, and, taken with the other archeological evidence, indicate that the city expanded outside the citadel walls in the final centuries of Byzantine rule.

#### CONCLUSION

The late antique cities of Anatolia had their individual characters, sometimes only dimly visible through the scattered evidence. Ankara, too, had a personality of its own: it was a prosperous and busy city, a center of the army, administration, and trade. Its enterprising merchants traveled throughout the eastern Empire, while its streets saw the passage of armies and emperors—Julian held court, Jovian entered on his ill-fated consulship, and Arcadius so liked the city that it became his summer resort. Constantinople was represented by the governor of Galatia and the vicar of Pontus with

<sup>205</sup> Detailed description: Jerphanion, *Mélanges*, 113–43; summaries: R. Krautheimer, *Early Christian and Byzantine Architecture* (Baltimore, 1965), 202–4; Restle (*supra*, note 153), 172–75. For an attempt to place the church in a broad stylistic development, see H. Buchwald, *The Church of the Archangels in Sige* (Vienna, 1969), 36–62, *passim*. A late antique tombstone reused in the church may suggest that it stood in or near a graveyard, and perhaps strengthens the identification of the site with Cryptus. The inscription on the stone, which is unpublished, was kindly communicated to me by Prof. Ševčenko.

<sup>206</sup> Baths: pottery: Dolunay, *op. cit.* (*supra*, note 142), fig. 81, impressed ware of perhaps the tenth century; cf. *The Great Palace of the Byzantine Emperors* (Oxford, 1947), 41–46 and pl. 17 (my thanks to Dr. Judith Herrin for this reference); coins: see Appendix II. Inscription of Temple: Grégoire, *op. cit.* (*supra*, note 154), 449–53; for a similar inscription, with further parallels, see T. Drew-Bear and C. Foss, "The Epitaph of Thomas: A Middle Byzantine Verse Inscription from Afyon," *Byzantion*, 39 (1969), 74–85. The insipid verses of Eustathius had the rare good fortune of inspiring a modern poet, G. Seferis, who saw them in 1949 during a long stay in Ankara: see his poem, *Ankyrano Mnemeio*, and his remarks on the monument, in *Meres tou 1945–1951* (Athens, 1973), 140, 144; English trans. A. Anagnostopoulos, *Days of 1945–1951* (Cambridge, Mass., 1974), 116–20. I am grateful to Mr. Anagnostopoulos for drawing my attention to this work.

large staffs to carry out their duties, while local administration was run by the municipal senate of rich and cultivated men. In the time of Libanius the network of influence in which these men and the officers of the government were involved gives some insight into the nature of power in the city and the whole Empire. The tranquil façade of the pagan upper classes was only part of the picture; Ankara was subject to riot and violence like other cities, and the triumph of Christianity which occasioned much of the disturbance reveals some aspect of the life of the rest of the population. Piety and its close associate, fanaticism, were manifest in the actions of the humblest citizens and the most exalted prelates from the great persecutions until the end of the period. The new religion captured and transformed the upper classes of Libanius' day, so that a century later some of them were affecting simplicity or abandoning the secular world. By the time of Justinian, much had changed under the constant corrosion of imperial financial demands and the devastating attack of the bubonic plague. The ruling classes virtually disappeared, replaced by military officers, the Protectors, who were readily willing to call in a local holy man to save the city by his magic.

The vivid flashes of the sources are reflected in the archeological record where a few instances may indicate general trends. Prosperity, though not the opulence of an earlier age, appears in the Roman baths rebuilt and maintained after the troubles of the third century. The life of the ruling classes seems to find its counterpart in the substantial private houses with their mosaics and baths, while the triumph of Christianity is clearly manifested in the conversion of the greatest temple of the city into a church or monastery. The column "of Julian" remains an enigma—its date and purpose unknown—but certainly a monument of the age.

Neither the army, for which Ankara was a major headquarters, nor the Church, which flourished in it, could save the city from the fire-worshipping armies of Chosroes in 622. Parts of the lower city were ruined forever, while the population fled or suffered massacre or slavery. This disastrous event marked a clear break in the life of the city. The late antique metropolis disappeared, but Ankara remained one of the greatest cities of Asia Minor by the reduced standards of the day. The seventh century, which brought not only the Persians but the Arabs as sackers of cities, also produced the magnificent ramparts which symbolize the will of the city to live and to resist its most determined foes. Through the long and obscure ages of Byzantine rule Ankara was a great fortress, and it remained an economic and administrative center. Its location on a great highway, which had bestowed prominence in the beginning, always kept Ankara great. "Charming Ankara, the most brilliant of cities," kneeling at the feet of Michael the Drunkard, was raised by his buildings and his battles to overcome her adversaries and to be remembered in the Byzantine epic as "the famous and great castle, the powerful and fortified Ankara." But the epic age which praised her turned its attention farther east, leaving the city to pass obscure and prosperous centuries in which construction expanded beyond the citadel walls. The peace was suddenly

interrupted in the mid-eleventh century by the arrival of the Turks, who soon brought Ankara under their rule and introduced a new age destined to bring the city greater size, wealth, and renown than it had ever known.<sup>207</sup>

## APPENDIX I

### New Governors of Galatia and Vicars of Pontus

The authenticity of the following names, attested in the saints' lives, cannot be guaranteed:

#### Governors:

- Curicius 305/11  
*Hegemon* at Ankara under Galerius, failed in his effort to move St. Clement from Christianity: *Vita Clementis*, PG, 114, cols. 860–64.
- Lucius 311/13  
*Hegemon* at Ankara under Maximian; ordered execution of Clement and his companions: *Vita Clementis*, col. 884.
- Hadrianus 305/13  
*Hegemon*, apparently of Galatia; persecutor of Antiochus, brother of St. Plato: *Synaxarium CP*, 824f.

#### Vicars:

- Domitianus 305/11  
 τὴν τοῦ βικαρίου ἀρχὴν ἔχοντι καὶ τοῖς μέρεσι τῆς Γαλατίας ἐνδιατρίβοντι; persecutor of St. Clement: *Vita Clementis*, cols. 825–28.
- Domitius 305/11  
 St. Clement was sent for judgment to Δομετίῳ βικαρίῳ τὴν Ἀμισσηνῶν ἀρχὴν διέποντι: *Vita Clementis*, cols. 864–69. Perhaps identical with the preceding.
- Agrippinus 305/11  
 Vicar at Ankara, persecutor of St. Plato: *Vita Platonis*, PG, 115, *passim*. Responsible also for execution of Eustathius, Gaianus, *et al.*: *Synaxarium CP*, 766. Perhaps to be identified with Agrippinus, *eparch* at Nicomedia (i.e., Praetorian Prefect?) under Galerius: *Vita Clementis*, cols. 852–60, or with the recipient of *CJ*, IV.29.15, a law of 294.

<sup>207</sup> It is a pleasure to record the help I have received. A grant from the American Council of Learned Societies enabled me to travel to Ankara and carry out the necessary field work. While there, I enjoyed the hospitality of the British Institute of Archaeology and the assistance of its director, Mr. David French. Bay Raci Temizer, director of the Museum of Anatolian Civilizations, granted me free access to the unpublished coins of the Çankırıkapı excavations, and Bay Musa Kurum, numismatist of the museum, assisted in inspecting them. The work of assembling source material was lightened by Dr. Friedrich Hild of the *Tabula Imperii byzantini* in Vienna, who allowed me to consult the extensive files on Byzantine sites which his team has compiled.

## APPENDIX II

## Coins from the Roman Gymnasium at Çankırıkapı:

## A summary tabulation

(All coins are bronze unless otherwise indicated)

|                                      |    |  |
|--------------------------------------|----|--|
| Pre-third century .....              | 15 |  |
| Third century:                       |    |  |
| Antoniniani: Gordian III .....       | 1  |  |
| Quietus-Carinus .....                | 39 |  |
| Local issues .....                   | 68 |  |
| Diocletian-Licinius .....            | 45 |  |
| Constantine .....                    | 32 |  |
| Constantius II-Jovian .....          | 30 |  |
| Valens & colleagues .....            | 12 |  |
| Theodosius, Arcadius, Honorius ..... | 47 |  |
| Late fourth century .....            | 20 | (Cannot be more closely attributed)            |
| Theodosius II .....                  | 2  |  |
| Marcian .....                        | 2  |  |
| Leo I .....                          | 9  |  |
| Zeno .....                           | 1  |  |
| Anastasius .....                     | 4  |  |
| Anastasius hoard .....               | 32 | All <i>minimi</i> in remarkably fine condition |
| Fifth century .....                  | 4  | Unattributable <i>minimi</i>                   |
| Justinian .....                      | 6  |  |
| Justin II .....                      | 5  |  |
| Tiberius .....                       | 1  |  |
| Maurice .....                        | 5  |  |
| Sixth century .....                  | 1  | "E" (5-nummia) unattributable                  |
| Focas .....                          | 2  | Includes one gold tremissis                    |
| Heraclius: Tremissis .....           | 6  |  |
| AE type I (610-13) .....             | 4  |  |
| type II (612-16) .....               | 1  |  |
| type IV (yr. 30 = 639/40) ..         | 1  |  |
| Constans II: AV Solidus .....        | 1  | Class IV (654-59)                              |
| AE .....                             | 1  | Attribution uncertain                          |
| Leo IV: Class I (776-78) .....       | 1  |  |
| Theophilus: Class I (829-30) .....   | 1  |  |
| Leo VI .....                         | 8  |  |
| Romanus Lecapenus .....              | 1  |  |
| Anonymous AE: Class A (1) .....      | 2  | (970-76?)                                      |
| Class A (2) .....                    | 1  | (976?-ca. 1030/35)                             |
| Class I .....                        | 1  | (ca. 1075-80)                                  |
| Constantine X .....                  | 2  |  |
| Romanus IV .....                     | 1  |  |